

# Does the Use of Unusual Combinations of Datasets Contribute to Greater Scientific Impact?

Yulin Yu<sup>\*1</sup>, Daniel M. Romero<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Information, University of Michigan

<sup>2</sup> Center for the Study of Complex Systems, University of Michigan

\* Address correspondence to: yulinyu@umich.edu

February 12, 2024

## Abstract

Scientific datasets play a crucial role in contemporary data-driven research, as they allow for the progress of science by facilitating the discovery of new patterns and phenomena. This mounting demand for empirical research raises important questions on how strategic data utilization in research projects can stimulate scientific advancement. In this study, we examine the hypothesis inspired by the recombination theory, which suggests that innovative combinations of existing knowledge, including the use of unusual combinations of datasets, can lead to high-impact discoveries. We investigate the scientific outcomes of such atypical data combinations in more than 30,000 publications that leverage over 6,000 datasets curated within one of the largest social science databases, ICPSR. This study offers four important insights. First, combining datasets, particularly those infrequently paired, significantly contributes to both scientific and broader impacts (e.g., dissemination to the general public). Second, the combination of datasets with atypically combined topics has the opposite effect – the use of such data is associated with fewer citations. Third, younger and less experienced research teams tend to use atypical combinations of datasets in research at a higher frequency than their older and more experienced counterparts. Lastly, despite the benefits of data combination, papers that amalgamate data remain infrequent. This finding suggests that the unconventional combination of datasets is an under-utilized but powerful strategy correlated with the scientific and broader impact of scientific discoveries.

## Introduction

The recognition of the immense power of datasets in scientific and economic advancements has prompted academia, industry, and society to collectively invest substantial effort in generating and making datasets publicly available [1–3]. The open science movement, for instance, has emphasized the crucial practice of data sharing to enhance research reproducibility, facilitate collaboration, and enable subsequent studies [4–7]. Initially, the call

for sharing and managing datasets faced numerous barriers, including limited funding [8], inadequate institutional support, time constraints [9], lack of suitable platforms [10], and a lack of sharing social norms in academia [11, 12]. Fortunately, over the past decade, there has been a notable increase in funding, institutional and support, and the development of platforms dedicated to supporting data sharing and curation [13–15]. As a result, a wealth of publicly available datasets is now accessible for reuse [13, 16–19].

Given the wide accessibility of publicly available data and the significance of datasets within the scientific community, it is crucial to understand *how* scientists utilize these datasets, especially when their use fosters high-impact and innovative scientific development. Numerous studies have endeavored to discern the motivations and challenges surrounding the reuse of datasets [8, 20, 21]. These studies aim to promote data reuse and enhance the curation process (such as improving the data search experience) [22, 23], thereby encouraging researchers to effectively utilize existing datasets or identify suitable data for their studies. However, the link between dataset utilization and scientific advancement remains uncertain. In this study, we aim to fill this gap, particularly by analyzing how strategic data utilization in research projects can drive scientific advancement and foster high-impact, innovative scientific development.

A line of study in recombination theory offers a broader perspective on the potential relationship between diversity (unusual combinations) and scientific advancement. This body of literature suggests that unconventional combinations of existing knowledge that retain a certain level of conventionality (e.g., combining two high-impact findings from different domains) can lead to novel discoveries and scientific breakthroughs [24, 24–28]. While these studies do not offer empirical evidence linking data usage practices to scientific advancement, they do provide valuable insights that lead us to ask: do unconventional combinations of datasets contribute to scientific breakthroughs? Examining the scientific impact of novel dataset combinations can provide valuable insights for publication agencies, data curators, researchers, and funders. These findings can inform the development of policies and practices that facilitate and encourage data linking, ultimately enhancing the overall research landscape.

In order to examine the potential for a unique combination of datasets to contribute to scientific breakthroughs, we first assess the level of scientific attention through citations received by publications that utilize multiple datasets (using data combination). We then define a unique combination of datasets as one that is infrequently employed and quantify its relationship with scientific influence. Moreover, we leverage the topic tags linked to each individual dataset to measure the uniqueness of dataset combinations in relation to their content. We aim to explore whether novelty in dataset combinations and topic combinations exerts distinct influences on scientific advancement.

We have compiled a comprehensive dataset comprising more than 30,000 papers that utilize over 6,000 distinct datasets. The dataset used in our study was obtained from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR)<sup>1</sup>, a renowned data curation service extensively utilized by social scientists. This dataset is meticulously labeled by ICPSR data curators, and the linkage between datasets and publications is established only when a paper extensively employs a particular dataset in its results. The precision of data

---

<sup>1</sup>[urlhttps://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/pages/](https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/pages/)

usage within publications is crucial for our analysis due to two reasons: first, data citations are commonly absent from certain publications [29,30], and second, datasets are often cited for various reasons, many of which do not indicate substantial reuse (e.g., citing in the introduction or discussion) [31,32]. After identifying this crucial dataset from ICPSR, we connect the publication record data through Crossref<sup>2</sup>, OpenAlex<sup>3</sup>, and Altmetrics<sup>4</sup>, which provide information on citations and mentions of the research papers over the past decade on online platforms, such as news and social media. An complete description of our data description is provided in the 'Materials and Methods' section and in the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 1. The granularity and scale of our data allowed us to define unique data combinations in various ways, such as uniqueness in data usage and uniqueness in data topics. We investigate the impact of unique data combinations across multiple dimensions, including scientific impact (e.g., citations) and broader impacts (e.g., policy implications and general knowledge impact). Consequently, our study offers a systematic investigation into the effect of the uniqueness of data integration on scientific and broader impacts.

## The effect of dataset combinations on scientific impact

A prerequisite for data combination is using multiple datasets. Thus, our analysis begins by examining the impact of using multiple datasets on the paper's citations. Our primary citation impact metric is the number of citations a paper obtained in the fixed number of years after publication.

Since our outcome variable tracks the counts of citations and exhibits a long tail distribution (see Figure S5 in Supplemental Information (SI)), we employ a Poisson regression to effectively model the relationship between citation count and the use of multiple datasets. Further, we control for average data use frequency, since frequently used datasets could link to trending topics. Additionally, we control for the impact of team size, team experience, disciplines, publication time, and journal impact factor, as these factors have been found to influence citation performance due to their influence on team composition and journal characteristics [33–36]. We provide a detailed explanation of these measurements in the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix Section 3. In our initial analysis, we use a binary variable that encodes whether a publication utilizes multiple datasets (data combination) or a single dataset and the number of citations 3, 5, and 10 years after publication as the outcome variable. As shown in Figure 1, the Poisson regression results show a statistically significant increase in citations for papers that use multiple datasets, compared to those that did not (P-value < 0.001). Papers that used more than one dataset garnered 22%, 15%, and 15% more citations over 3, 5, and 10 years relative to papers that used a single dataset (See Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix Section 4, regression table S1 - S3). As shown in the inset of Figure 1, over time, the effect has remained significant and consistent, except for papers published before 1900. There is a notably larger effect size in recent years, particularly after 2000 (see SI Appendix section 4 Table S4 - S7 for full regression table). We additionally perform an analysis treating our binary variable as a continuous one that

---

<sup>2</sup>[urlhttps://www.crossref.org/](https://www.crossref.org/)

<sup>3</sup>[urlhttps://openalex.org/](https://openalex.org/)

<sup>4</sup>[urlhttps://www.altmetric.com/](https://www.altmetric.com/)




Figure 1: The plot illustrates the regression coefficient and 95% confidence intervals (CIs), offering valuable insights into the influence of dataset combination in research papers on citation rates over 3, 5, and 10 years (as outcome variables). This regression result displays coefficients after collectively controlling dataset usage frequency, author attributes (including the number of authors and their experience), journal citation metrics, publication timing, and subject areas. In addition, the inset of Figure 1 show the regression coefficients and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) presented separately for analyses conducted on publications published in four distinct periods: before 1990, 1990-2000, 2000-2010, and 2010-2020. Our results reveal that the primary findings are primarily influenced by the more recent years, particularly those after 2000.

represents the number of datasets used in a paper. The results obtained from this analysis are qualitatively similar (See Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix Section 4, regression table S8 - S10).

## Atypical combinations of datasets associate with high impact

Subsequently, we evaluate the impact of data combination beyond the number of datasets; we now consider the impact of using rarely combined datasets. We assess the atypicality of a paper’s data usage by employing the Sterling index [37], a general-purpose measure of atypicality. Prior studies have utilized the Sterling index to quantify atypicality in the combination of references or multidisciplinary contexts [38,39]. The Sterling index varies from 0 to 1, with higher values denoting greater atypicality. The ‘Materials and Methods’ section provides additional operational details of this metric. We also provide examples representing the top 25% and bottom 25% of data combinations, as determined by the atypicality of data combination score, in the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 2. Figure 2(c) also illustrates the measurement.

We employed fixed-effects Poisson regressions to investigate the effect of the atypicality of dataset combination on the citation impact of a paper. In the primary analysis, we examine exclusively 8,881 papers that employ a minimum of two datasets and utilize a

### Effect Of Atypicality Of Data Combination On Citation And Broader Impact




Figure 2: Unique combinations of data lead to higher citation rates and broader impacts. (a) The regression coefficient and 95% CIs illustrate the citation impact of atypicality in dataset combinations while controlling for the various factors indicated in the panel headings. The leftmost panels display coefficients of atypicality in baseline regressions (without any control variables), while the rightmost panels display coefficients after collectively controlling for dataset attributes (use frequency and number of datasets), author attributes (number of authors and experience), journal citation, publication time, subjects, and paper novelty.(b) The regression coefficient and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) provide insights into the impact of atypicality in dataset combination on Twitter, Wikipedia, policy, and news mentions (outcome variables). This regression incorporates all of the control variables outlined in (a) within the full control framework. (c) Illustration of quantifying atypicality of datasets. In this illustration, we assume that a paper uses two datasets, namely  $dataset_1$  and  $dataset_2$ . To quantify the relationship between these datasets, we initially vectorize them into one-hot vectors. Each coordinate in the vector corresponds to a paper in our dataset, and the coordinate takes a value of 1 if the respective dataset is used in that paper and a value of 0 if otherwise. Subsequently, we calculate the distance, denoted as  $D_{12}$ , by computing cosine similarity between dataset1 and dataset2. Using the number of datasets in a given paper, we calculate the parameters  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , which represent the ratio of a dataset used within a research paper. In this particular scenario, where there are two datasets used in the paper, both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are equal to  $1/2$ . Utilizing the equation provided earlier, we apply the same calculation for any two datasets in the paper in order to examine their respective relationships and atypicality.

three-year citation window to determine the citation impact of publications. Additionally, in the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 4 Table S22, we provide results on alternative citation impact measurements, including the five and ten-year citation window and whether a paper is in the top 5% most cited in our dataset [38,40]. Here, we also use control variables, including team size, team experience, journal impact factor, disciplines, publication time, and average data use frequency, as in the previous analysis. Additionally, we control for the number of datasets utilized in the paper, which have been shown to be associated with citation impact in our first analysis. Furthermore, acknowledging prior research that indicates a link between atypical combinations of prior knowledge and citation impact [27,40], we account for this effect by controlling for the atypicality in the combination of references' journals, which we refer to as *paper novelty* in our study (See Materials and Methods and Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 3. for a full description of this measure).

Figure 2(a) displays the regression coefficients of the main and several control variables (see the full regression table in Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 4 Table S11.). The result suggests that papers that utilize more uncommonly combined datasets significantly garner more citations (P-value <0.001). For each standard deviation increase in data atypicality, papers receive 32% more citations. These results hold robust across various settings and controls, including when we measure the outcome variables as the number of citations obtained within five and ten years after publication or consider whether the paper became a hit paper (the 5% most cited papers), as shown in the SI Appendix, section 4 Table S11-S13 (outcome as 3, 5, and 10-year citations) and S22 (5% most cited papers). We also find that dataset atypicality retains its strong, significant explanatory power, even after accounting for potential confounding factors, including paper novelty, team composition, journal-related characteristics, and dataset-related features. Over time, the effect remains significant and consistent, with a noticeably larger effect size in recent years. As shown in the SI Appendix, section 4 Table S14 - S17, the effects for each time period are as follows: before 1990 (21%), 1990-2000(8%), 2000-2010(54%) and 2010-2020(37%)

Furthermore, our analysis reveals that the impact of atypical dataset combinations on research publications extends beyond citation counts. We observe substantial effects on the broader dissemination of research findings, including their presence in general knowledge platforms such as Wikipedia, their presence on policy documents, and their attention on social media (Twitter) and news platforms. As illustrated in Figure 2(b), a one standard deviation increase in atypical dataset combinations is associated with a 23% increase in policy mentions, a 49% increase in Wikipedia mentions, a 70% increase in Twitter mentions, and a 29% increase in news mentions (see the full regression table in Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 4 Table S18 - S21.). An description of policy, Wikipedia, Twitter, and news mentions is provided in the Materials and Methods and the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 1.

# The effect of atypical dataset topic combinations on scientific impact

The datasets in our analysis are tagged with a set of expert-defined topics. For instance, the dataset titled “Cost of Living in the United States” includes topics such as consumers, the cost of living, economic indicators, expenses, families, households, income, urban populations, and the working class. This enables us to assess the atypicality, not only of individual datasets used in a paper, but also of the atypicality of the topics covered by such datasets. Our subsequent analysis explores the interplay between the atypicality of *topics within datasets* and their implications for scientific outcomes.

We measure topic typicality in the datasets used by academic papers using the Sterling index described above, though we consider the topics of the datasets, not the datasets, as the units of analysis to be combined. We operationalize the metric for “topic atypicality” by first taking the union of all topics associated with each dataset used by a paper and then measuring the atypicality of these topics. This determines whether the paper uses datasets that collectively combine atypical topics. We include examples representing the top 25% and bottom 25% topic atypicality, as determined by topic atypicality score, in the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 2. Figure 3(a) illustrates the measurements of topic atypicality of datasets.

Figure 3(b) displays the regression results illustrating the correlation between citation impact and two atypicality metrics: atypicality of dataset combinations and topic atypicality. We present these results after controlling for the variables mentioned in the preceding analysis. Our results show that papers combining datasets with atypically combined topics unusually receive significantly fewer citations (P-value <0.001) 3 (8% decrease), 5 (5% decrease), or 10 years (5% decrease) after publication (see the full regression table in Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 4 Table S23-S25.). This suggests that while integrating multiple datasets with non-novel topics might enhance the exploration of fundamental topics in a research community, combining novel data sets on *conventional* topics might allow researchers to make difficult-to-make connections and explore conventional topics through new empirical lenses.

Figure 3(c) displays separate analyses conducted for each decade: publications before 1900 (grouped due to limited observations), 1990-2000, 2000-2010, and 2010-2020. Our results reveal that the main result is driven by recent publications, particularly after 2000. While the impact of dataset atypicality on citations consistently remains positive over time, the effect size for publications in the last two decades is significantly larger compared to papers from before the 21st century. The influence of topic atypicality is either very small or statistically insignificant for publications before 2000. However, from 2000 onwards, this effect becomes consistently significant. (see the full regression table in Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 4 Table S26 -S29.)

## What type of research teams combine atypical datasets?

Given that data combinations, particularly atypical combinations, contribute to scientific impact, our final analysis aims to understand which research teams are more likely to employ




Figure 3: Papers’ unique combination of datasets is more impactful when they combine individual datasets with ‘conventional’ topics. (a) Illustration of quantifying topic atypicality: In this illustration, we consider a hypothetical paper that utilizes two datasets, namely *dataset<sub>1</sub>* and *dataset<sub>2</sub>*. The first dataset, *dataset<sub>1</sub>*, is associated with two topic tags: *Topic<sub>1</sub>* and *Topic<sub>2</sub>*, while the second dataset, *dataset<sub>2</sub>*, is associated with two topic tags: *Topic<sub>2</sub>* and *Topic<sub>3</sub>*. To compute the topics of datasets used in this paper, we combine all the topics from both datasets, resulting in *Topic<sub>1</sub>*, *Topic<sub>2</sub>*, and *Topic<sub>3</sub>*. Subsequently, we represent each of these topics as a one-hot vector. In this representation, each coordinate in the vector corresponds to a paper, and the coordinate takes a value of 1 if the respective topic is present in that paper; otherwise, it takes a value of 0. Using cosine similarity, we calculate the distance between these topic vectors, and we apply similar quantification methods to all pairs of topics. This process allows us to determine the topic atypicality within the paper. (b) The regression coefficient and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) reveal the citation impact when combining “conventional” topics (low topic atypicality). Our model includes two main independent variables: topic atypicality and atypicality of data combinations. The dependent variable is the three-year citation count, and the model incorporates all the control variables described in the preceding section (full control setting). (c) The regression coefficients and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) are presented separately for analyses conducted on publications published in four distinct periods: before 1990, 1990-2000, 2000-2010, and 2010-2020. Our results reveal that the primary findings are primarily influenced by the more recent years, particularly those after 2000.






Figure 4: Despite the high value associated with utilizing multiple datasets, research teams seldom combine data. While large and more experience teams are more likely to use multiple datasets (data combination), smaller and less experienced teams are more inclined to use atypical datasets combination. (a)(b) Impact of Team Size on Dataset Utilization: The regression coefficient and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) reveal the effect of the number of authors (team size) on the likelihood of research teams utilizing multiple datasets and incorporating atypical combinations of datasets in their papers. (c)(d) Impact of Team Experience on Dataset Utilization: The regression coefficient and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) demonstrate the effect of team experience, measured by the average number of citation counts of authors, on the likelihood of research teams utilizing multiple datasets and incorporating atypical combinations of datasets in their papers.

atypical data. Prior studies have emphasized the significance of teams in fostering scientific innovation [40,41] and have focused especially on team size. Meanwhile, it is posited that the age or experience of authors is associated with creativity and innovation [42]. Therefore, we also seek to gain insights into the types of teams that are more inclined to utilize an atypical combination of datasets. We utilize logistic regression to model two relationships: 1) the likelihood of using multiple datasets (data combination) and team size (Model a in Fig.4) and 2) the likelihood of using multiple datasets and team experience (Model c). Then, we use Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression to model relationships between: 3) team size and the atypicality of data combinations (Model b), and 4) the atypicality of data combinations and team experience (Model d). To model 1) and 2), we control for average data use frequency and the impact factor of the journal. To model 3) and 4), we further include control variables for the number of datasets. We find that larger or more experienced teams, as measured by the average citation count of the authors, tend to use multiple datasets. Furthermore, smaller or less experienced teams tend to use atypical combinations of datasets. However, when examining all the research teams in our dataset, we observe that less than 30% of the research teams (29%) in our analysis incorporate multiple datasets (See the Supplemental Information (SI) Appendix, section 4 Table S31 - S34, for full regression tables).

## Discussion

By conducting a meticulous analysis of a curated dataset comprising over 30,000 papers and over 6,000 datasets, we have found that the combination of datasets, particularly those that

are not typically combined, is associated with an overall higher citation rate (a 32% increase per one standard deviation difference). This finding remains robust even after controlling for various factors, such as disciplines, team compositions, time periods, and paper novelty. A noteworthy finding in this work is that novelty in data combinations does not invariably yield positive results – the atypicality of topic combinations shows that employing datasets with conventional topics garners more citations.

Our study parallels previous research asserting that atypical combinations of previous knowledge lead to high-impact scientific findings [40]. However, we build upon this work by uncovering specific implications for data use. While previous studies have examined novelty in a uni-dimensional manner, without specifying how various aspects of a scientific paper’s novelty relate to its scientific impact [25, 43–49], or have solely investigated novelty in certain aspects that are orthogonal to data use (such as methods, theories, and finding) [50], this research advances our understanding on the association between data use and impact. Importantly, we found that novelty in datasets, the cornerstone of data-driven studies, has a significantly larger effect size on citations than novelty at the paper level as measured by references. This suggests that novelty in data may be more impactful than general novelty of knowledge. Previous studies have primarily found a positive impact of novel combinations various aspects of a paper, such as references, methods, and results [24, 24–28]. In contrast, our research suggests that combinations of datasets of unusually combined topics can also have a negative impact.

Beyond academic contributions, our findings also present strategies for scientists, policymakers, and data curators for using and managing scientific data for research. We encourage researchers to explore new research avenues by combining infrequently paired datasets, while also considering “conventionality” — whether the topics of combined datasets are relatively “traditional”. Given that data combination has a significant effect on producing high-impact scientific findings, policymakers may encourage or even require the publication of data, particularly when it includes the possibility of linking to other data sources [19, 51]. Similarly, data curators might consider making datasets more “linkable” to other public datasets. For example, in research that employs individual publications as observations, we recommend that researchers include DOIs in their published data to facilitate linking by other researchers. Concurrently, data curators could create a data recommender system that considers the novelty of data pairings as part of the recommendations for data use. [23].

Several potential avenues for future research can be pursued based on the current results. First, considering the significant value of data combination in scientific outcomes, it is noteworthy that researchers seldom engage in this practice. Future studies could delve into the multiple stakeholders involved in data curation and research, aiming to understand the reasons behind the infrequent combination of data and the challenges encountered when attempting to combine datasets atypically. A comprehensive qualitative investigation may be necessary to shed light on these issues.

Second, we recommend a causal analysis to discern the mechanisms behind the increased scientific and broader impacts resulting from the combination of usually paired data. For instance, does the scientific community place greater value on evaluating hypotheses across multiple datasets and different settings? Or does connecting data, such as linking two datasets through a shared variable, lead to more groundbreaking scientific discoveries? To address these questions, the establishment of an improved data citation infrastructure that

includes additional indications and labels for data linking is crucial.

Third, it is worth noting that our analysis focused solely on social science research. Future research should aim to replicate our findings in other disciplines. Moreover, exploring the potential heterogeneous effects of data combination across different fields, given disciplinary variations in data curation and usage practices, would be valuable. However, the successful execution of such studies is contingent upon resolving the challenges associated with data citation infrastructure, such as the labor-intensive nature of manual data citation. Apart from our dataset, data citations in other contexts should also be considered.

The strategic utilization of datasets in research holds promise for scientific advancement. Although combining datasets, particularly through atypical combinations, is not yet a common practice, our research suggests that promoting this approach among researchers, policies, and data curators could lead to scientific products that advance knowledge and raise awareness of scientific contributions.

## Materials and Methods

Our analysis is based on a dataset comprising over 30,366 papers published in the past six decades, which extensively utilize 6,859 datasets from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) [52]. The ICPSR is a leading provider of social science data for research, offering a comprehensive archive of data sources. The link between the dataset and publication is manually curated, with a link established only when a publication significantly utilizes the datasets to produce results, as opposed to brief or tangential references. The initial dataset comprises 101,674 publications, out of which 59,315 are missing DOI information. We locate papers that lacked DOIs in the dataset by matching titles, publication years, and author information through CrossRef. This process yields a total of 90,693 papers. Subsequently, we gather further information about each paper (e.g., citation counts, discipline, publication year, impact factor, references) and each author (e.g., author experience measured by number of citations) via the OpenAlex API [53]. Out of the 90,693 papers, 78,964 have records on OpenAlex, 51,209 include also author information, and 30,366 papers published before 2020 also have both concept (subject) tags and references available. Ultimately, our final sample consists of 30,366 papers, all of which have comprehensive information across all the aforementioned categories and were published before 2020. We also leverage the Altmetric dataset to identify mentions of research papers across multiple online sources, such as news, social media, policy documents, and Wikipedia. This dataset, provided by Altmetric (version as of July 3rd, 2023), extensively monitors various online platforms to detect posts containing links or references to published research. Additional details can be found in the SI Appendix section 1.

### Atypicality of dataset measurement

To measure novelty, we adopt a general framework provided by the Stirling diversity measurement [37, 38]. Our novelty metric centers on dataset pairings within a paper, with infrequently paired datasets considered novel. From our dataset, we can calculate how often each pair of datasets has been used together in papers drawing from ICPSR data. Here,

$Unusualness_c^{\text{Dataset}}$  represents the atypicality of dataset combinations of paper  $c$ .  $d_c$  represents the set of datasets used in paper  $c$ , and  $i, j \in d_c$ .  $D_{ij}$  represents the cosine similarity between dataset  $i$  and  $j$  in the data co-citation matrix, with  $P_i^c$  and  $P_j^c$  representing the proportion of datasets in paper  $c$ . To compute  $D_{ij}$ , we create an *article vector*  $h^a$  for each dataset  $a$ . Each coordinate in vector  $h^a$  represents an article, and  $h^a(b)$  is 1 if dataset  $a$  is used in article  $b$ , and 0 otherwise.  $D_{ij}$  is then defined as the cosine similarity between  $h^i$  and  $h^j$ .  $P_i^c$  and  $P_j^c$  are propositional representations of dataset  $i$  and dataset  $j$  in article  $c$  ( $P_i^c = \frac{1}{N}$  and  $N$  is the total number of datasets in article  $c$ ).  $Unusualness_c^{\text{Dataset}}$  is defined in Equation 1. In the regression analysis, we standardize the atypicality score to account for potential variations and enhance comparability across different variables.

$$Unusualness_c^{\text{Dataset}} = 1 - \sum_{ij \in d_c} D_{ij} * P_i^c * P_j^c \quad (1)$$

## Topic atypicality

Adopting a similar quantification methodology as shown in Equation 1, we first gather all topics covered by the datasets used in a single publication and calculate how often each pair of data topics has been used together amongst all ICPSR datasets. Here,  $Unusualness_c^{\text{Topic}}$  represents the topic atypicality of the dataset of paper  $c$ .  $t_c$  represents the union of topics covered by the datasets used in paper  $c$ , and  $u, v \in t_c$ , with  $D_{uv}$  representing the cosine similarity between dataset topics, and  $P_u^c$  representing the proportion of topics in a dataset. To compute  $D_{uv}$ , we create an *article vector*  $h^t$  for each topic  $t$ . Each coordinate of the vector  $h^t$  represents each dataset’s topic  $m$  in our sample, where each coordinate corresponds to an article, and  $h^t(m)$  is 1 if topic  $t$  is used in article  $m$ , and 0 otherwise. With the article vectors defined, we can compare how different topics are utilized in the article. We calculate  $D_{uv}$  via computing cosine similarity between  $h^u$  and  $h^v$ .  $P_u^c$  and  $P_v^c$  are propositional representations of topic  $u$  and topic  $v$  in article  $c$  ( $P_u^c = \frac{1}{N}$  and  $N$  is the total number of topics in article  $c$ ).  $Unusualness_c^{\text{Topic}}$  is defined in Equation 2.

$$Unusualness_c^{\text{topic}} = 1 - \sum_{uv \in t_c} D_{uv} * P_u^c * P_v^c \quad (2)$$

## Paper novelty

To measure the novelty of a paper, we use a similar approach to the one used to measure the atypicality of datasets (Equation 1). Following prior work [40], our novelty measure centers on journal pairings referenced within a paper, with infrequently paired journals considered novel. We calculate how often each pair of journals has been referenced together in papers, drawing on OpenAlex data.  $Unusualness_c^{\text{Journal}}$  represents the paper novelty of paper  $c$ .  $t_j$  represents the set of journals referenced in paper  $c$ , and  $p, q \in t_j$ . Here,  $D_{pq}$  represents the cosine similarity between journals  $p$  and  $q$  in the journal co-citation matrix, with  $P_p^c$  and  $P_q^c$  representing the proportion of reference’s journal in a publication. To compute  $D_{pq}$ , we create an *article vector*  $h^e$  for each journal  $e$ , with  $h^e(b)$  being 1 if journal  $e$  is referenced in article  $b$  and 0 otherwise. With the article vectors defined, we can compare how different journals are utilized in the papers. We calculate  $D_{pq}$  via the cosine similarity between  $h^p$

and  $h^q$ .  $P_p^c$  and  $P_q^c$  are propositional representations of journal  $p$  and journal  $q$  in article  $c$ . Further details are provided in the SI Appendix, section 3.  $Unusualness_c^{\text{Journal}}$  is defined in Equation 3.

$$Unusualness_c^{\text{Reference}} = 1 - \sum_{pq \in t_j} D_{pq} * P_p^c * P_q^c \quad (3)$$

## References

- [1] Viktor Mayer-Schönberger and Kenneth Cukier. *Big Data: A Revolution that Will Transform how We Live, Work, and Think*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013.
- [2] Virginia Gewin. Data sharing: An open mind on open data. *Nature*, 529(7584):117–119, January 2016.
- [3] Brooks Hanson, Andrew Sugden, and Bruce Alberts. Making data maximally available. *Science*, 331(6018):649, February 2011.
- [4] Mokter Hossain and Ilkka Kauranen. Open innovation in SMEs: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 9(1):58–73, January 2016.
- [5] Peter Murray-Rust. Open data in science. *Nature Precedings*, pages 1–1, January 2008.
- [6] Matthias Scheffler, Martin Aeschlimann, Martin Albrecht, Tristan Berau, Hans-Joachim Bungartz, Claudia Felser, Mark Greiner, Axel Groß, Christoph T Koch, Kurt Kremer, Wolfgang E Nagel, Markus Scheidgen, Christof Wöll, and Claudia Draxl. FAIR data enabling new horizons for materials research. *Nature*, 604(7907):635–642, April 2022.
- [7] Michael P Milham, R Cameron Craddock, Jake J Son, Michael Fleischmann, Jon Clucas, Helen Xu, Bonhwang Koo, Anirudh Krishnakumar, Bharat B Biswal, F Xavier Castellanos, Stan Colcombe, Adriana Di Martino, Xi-Nian Zuo, and Arno Klein. Assessment of the impact of shared brain imaging data on the scientific literature. *Nat. Commun.*, 9(1):2818, July 2018.
- [8] Carol Tenopir, Suzie Allard, Kimberly Douglass, Arsev Umur Aydinoglu, Lei Wu, Eleanor Read, Maribeth Manoff, and Mike Frame. Data sharing by scientists: practices and perceptions. *PloS one*, 6(6):e21101, 2011.
- [9] Carol Tenopir, Natalie M Rice, Suzie Allard, Lynn Baird, Josh Borycz, Lisa Christian, Bruce Grant, Robert Olendorf, and Robert J Sandusky. Data sharing, management, use, and reuse: Practices and perceptions of scientists worldwide. *PLoS One*, 15(3):e0229003, March 2020.
- [10] Christopher J Markiewicz, Krzysztof J Gorgolewski, Franklin Feingold, Ross Blair, Yaroslav O Halchenko, Eric Miller, Nell Hardcastle, Joe Wexler, Oscar Esteban, Mathias Goncavles, Anita Jwa, and Russell Poldrack. The OpenNeuro resource for sharing of neuroscience data. *Elife*, 10, October 2021.

- [11] Patrick Andreoli-Versbach and Frank Mueller-Langer. Open access to data: An ideal professed but not practised. *Res. Policy*, 43(9):1621–1633, November 2014.
- [12] Christy A Hipsley and Emma Sherratt. Psychology, not technology, is our biggest challenge to open digital morphology data. *Sci Data*, 6(1):41, April 2019.
- [13] Jocelyn Kaiser and Jeffrey Brainard. Ready, set, share! *Science*, 379(6630):322–325, 2023.
- [14] Thijs Devriendt, Mahsa Shabani, and Pascal Borry. Data sharing platforms and the academic evaluation system. *EMBO reports*, 21(8):e50690, 2020.
- [15] Eva Mendez, Rebecca Lawrence, Catriona J MacCallum, Eva Moar, and Inge Van Nieuwerburgh. Progress on open science: towards a shared research knowledge system. final report of the open science policy platform. 2020.
- [16] Jelte M Wicherts, Marjan Bakker, and Dylan Molenaar. Willingness to share research data is related to the strength of the evidence and the quality of reporting of statistical results. *PLoS One*, 6(11):e26828, November 2011.
- [17] Steve Kelling, Wesley M Hochachka, Daniel Fink, Mirek Riedewald, Rich Caruana, Grant Ballard, and Giles Hooker. Data-intensive science: A new paradigm for biodiversity studies. *Bioscience*, 59(7):613–620, July 2009.
- [18] Benedikt Fecher, Sascha Friesike, and Marcel Hebing. What drives academic data sharing? *PLoS One*, 10(2):e0118053, February 2015.
- [19] Ryan Hill, Carolyn Stein, and Heidi Williams. Internalizing externalities: Designing effective data policies. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 110:49–54, May 2020.
- [20] Irene V Pasquetto, Bernadette M Randles, and Christine L Borgman. On the reuse of scientific data. 2017.
- [21] Irene V Pasquetto, Christine L Borgman, and Morgan F Wofford. Uses and reuses of scientific data: The data creators’ advantage. 2019.
- [22] Sara Lafia, AJ Million, and Libby Hemphill. Direct, orienting, and scenic paths: How users navigate search in a research data archive. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval*, pages 128–136, 2023.
- [23] Vijay Viswanathan, Luyu Gao, Tongshuang Wu, Pengfei Liu, and Graham Neubig. DataFinder: Scientific dataset recommendation from natural language descriptions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 10288–10303, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [24] E Leahey, J Lee, and R J Funk. What types of novelty are most disruptive? *Am. Sociol. Rev.*

- [25] Brian Uzzi, Satyam Mukherjee, Michael Stringer, and Ben Jones. Atypical combinations and scientific impact. *Science*, 342(6157):468–472, October 2013.
- [26] Feng Shi and James Evans. Surprising combinations of research contents and contexts are related to impact and emerge with scientific outsiders from distant disciplines. *Nat. Commun.*, 14(1):1641, March 2023.
- [27] J G Foster, A Rzhetsky, and others. Tradition and innovation in scientists’ research strategies. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 2015.
- [28] Y Lin, J A Evans, and L Wu. New directions in science emerge from disconnection and discord. *J. Informetr.*, 2022.
- [29] Martin Fenner, Mercè Crosas, Jeffrey S Grethe, David Kennedy, Henning Hermjakob, Phillippe Rocca-Serra, Gustavo Durand, Robin Berjon, Sebastian Karcher, Maryann Martone, et al. A data citation roadmap for scholarly data repositories. *Scientific data*, 6(1):28, 2019.
- [30] Helena Cousijn, Patricia Feeney, Daniella Lowenberg, Eleonora Presani, and Natasha Simons. Bringing citations and usage metrics together to make data count. *Data Science Journal*, 18:9–9, 2019.
- [31] Elizabeth Moss and Jared Lyle. Opaque data citation: Actual citation practice and its implication for tracking data use. Poster presented at the 13th International Digital Curation Conference . . . , 2018.
- [32] Catherine Blake. Beyond genes, proteins, and abstracts: Identifying scientific claims from full-text biomedical articles. *Journal of biomedical informatics*, 43(2):173–189, 2010.
- [33] Stefan Wuchty, Benjamin F Jones, and Brian Uzzi. The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge. *Science*, 316(5827):1036–1039, 2007.
- [34] Katherine W McCain. Mapping authors in intellectual space: A technical overview. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science (1986-1998)*, 41(6):433, 1990.
- [35] Filippo Radicchi, Santo Fortunato, and Claudio Castellano. Universality of citation distributions: Toward an objective measure of scientific impact. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(45):17268–17272, 2008.
- [36] Sidney Redner. How popular is your paper? an empirical study of the citation distribution. *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, 4(2):131–134, 1998.
- [37] Andy Stirling. A general framework for analysing diversity in science, technology and society. *J. R. Soc. Interface*, 4(15):707–719, August 2007.
- [38] Yang Yang, Tanya Y Tian, Teresa K Woodruff, Benjamin F Jones, and Brian Uzzi. Gender-diverse teams produce more novel and higher-impact scientific ideas. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 119(36):e2200841119, September 2022.

- [39] Alan Porter and Ismael Rafols. Is science becoming more interdisciplinary? measuring and mapping six research fields over time. *Scientometrics*, 81(3):719–745, 2009.
- [40] Brian Uzzi, Satyam Mukherjee, Michael Stringer, and Ben Jones. Atypical combinations and scientific impact. *Science*, 342(6157):468–472, 2013.
- [41] Lingfei Wu, Dashun Wang, and James A Evans. Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. *Nature*, 566(7744):378–382, 2019.
- [42] Benjamin F Jones. The burden of knowledge and the “death of the renaissance man”: Is innovation getting harder? *The Review of Economic Studies*, 76(1):283–317, 2009.
- [43] Kevin Boudreau, Eva Catharina Guinan, Karim R Lakhani, and Christoph Riedl. The novelty paradox & bias for normal science: Evidence from randomized medical grant proposal evaluations. *Harvard Business School working paper series# 13-053*, 2012.
- [44] Dennis Verhoeven, Jurriën Bakker, and Reinhilde Veugelers. Measuring technological novelty with patent-based indicators. *Res. Policy*, 45(3):707–723, April 2016.
- [45] J Wang, R Veugelers, and P Stephan. Bias against novelty in science: A cautionary tale for users of bibliometric indicators. *Res. Policy*, 2017.
- [46] You-Na Lee, John P Walsh, and Jian Wang. Creativity in scientific teams: Unpacking novelty and impact. *Res. Policy*, 44(3):684–697, April 2015.
- [47] Lingfei Wu, Dashun Wang, and James A Evans. Large teams develop and small teams disrupt science and technology. *Nature*, 566(7744):378–382, February 2019.
- [48] Lutz Bornmann, Alexander Tekles, Helena H Zhang, and Fred Y Ye. Do we measure novelty when we analyze unusual combinations of cited references? a validation study of bibliometric novelty indicators based on F1000Prime data. *J. Informetr.*, 13(4):100979, November 2019.
- [49] Sotaro Shibayama, Deyun Yin, and Kuniko Matsumoto. Measuring novelty in science with word embedding. *PLoS One*, 16(7):e0254034, July 2021.
- [50] Erin Leahey, Jina Lee, and Russell J Funk. What types of novelty are most disruptive? *American Sociological Review*, 88(3):562–597, 2023.
- [51] J Mason Heberling, Joseph T Miller, Daniel Noesgaard, Scott B Weingart, and Dmitry Schigel. Data integration enables global biodiversity synthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 118(6), February 2021.
- [52] Sara Lafia, Lizhou Fan, Andrea Thomer, and Libby Hemphill. Subdivisions and cross-roads: Identifying hidden community structures in a data archive’s citation network. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 3(3):694–714, 2022.
- [53] Jason Priem, Heather Piwowar, and Richard Orr. Openalex: A fully-open index of scholarly works, authors, venues, institutions, and concepts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01833*, 2022.



# Supplementary Information

This document includes:

- Supplementary Note 1: Data Description
- Supplementary Note 2: Example of Measurements
- Supplementary Note 3: Variable Description
- Supplementary Note 4: Regression Tables
- Supplementary Note 5: Regression Equations

## 1. Data Description

In order to quantify the effect of atypicality of data combinations on scientific impact, we integrate three data resources.

(1) ICPSR Bibliography: a meticulously curated data citation link comprising social science datasets curated by ICPSR and publications published between 1962 and 2021 that have cited these datasets. This link is established exclusively when the publications incorporate comprehensive discussions of data-related methodologies. To ensure data accuracy, papers lacking DOIs in the dataset were located using CrossRef, supplemented by manual verification.

(2) Openalex dataset: a fully-open scientific knowledge graph was launched to replace the discontinued Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG), encompassing metadata for 209 million works and 2,013 million authors. In this project, we relied on the Openalex dataset (Openalex API) to extract publication information, including references, citations, author lists, and disciplines. Additionally, we extracted author information, such as their total citations.

(3) Altmetric Dataset: The Altmetric Dataset captures online attention given to research publications. It encompasses approximately 191 million mentions of 35 million research outputs and identifies references to research papers from various online sources, including news articles, social media platforms, policy documents, and Wikipedia. To identify paper mentions from news, social media, policy documents, and Wikipedia, we utilize DOI linking in our dataset. We extracted number of mentions in news, social media, policy documents, and Wikipedia for all papers included in the analysis till July 2023.

In total, we obtain 30,366 papers with 6,859 unique datasets that were published before 2020 with data citation in ICPSR.

## 2. Example of Measurements

### **Atypicality of dataset combination:**

10 random examples of top 25% quantile atypicality of data combination score and bottom 25% quantile atypicality of data combination score

10 Random draw of paper with topic 75% quartile atypicality of data combination (high novelty)

	title
1	Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1991: [United States]
	Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, 1995
	Survey of Youths in Custody, 1987: [United States]
2	Historical, Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: The United States, 1790-1970
	Correlates of War Project: International and Civil War Data, 1816-1992
	Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB), 1948-1978
3	National Corrections Reporting Program, 2006
	Annual Survey of Jails: Jurisdiction-Level Data, 2006
	Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 2002 [United States]
4	Polity Data: Persistence and Change in Political Systems, 1800-1971
	Polity II: Political Structures and Regime Change, 1800-1986
	Polity III: Regime Type and Political Authority, 1800-1994
5	Charlotte [North Carolina] Spouse Assault Replication Project, 1987-1989
	Violence and Threats of Violence Against Women and Men in the United States, 1994-1996
	National Crime Victimization Survey, 2000 [Record-Type Files]
6	National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988: Second Follow-Up (1992)
	National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972
	High School and Beyond, 1980: A Longitudinal Survey of Students in the United States
7	National Education Longitudinal Study: Base Year Through Fourth Follow-Up, 1988-2000
	High School and Beyond, 1980: Sophomore and Senior Cohort First Follow-Up (1982)
	National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972
8	National Nursing Home Survey, 1977
	Census of Population and Housing, 1980 [United States]: Public Use Microdata Sample (A Sample): 5-Percent Sample
	Current Population Survey: Annual Demographic File, 1984
9	Direction of Trade
	Correlates of War Project: International and Civil War Data, 1816-1992
	Polity II: Political Structures and Regime Change, 1800-1986
10	Census of Population and Housing, 1980 [United States]: Public Use Microdata Sample (A Sample): 1/1000 Sample
	Current Population Survey, May 1980
	Census of Population and Housing, 1980 [United States]: Public Use Microdata Sample (A Sample): 5-Percent Sample

10 Random draw of paper with topic 25% quatile atypicality of data combination (low novelty)

	title
1	National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988: Second Follow-Up (1992)
	National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988
	National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988: First Follow-up (1990)
2	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), 2003-2004
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), 1999-2000
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), 2001-2002
3	Current Population Survey, January 1984
	Current Population Survey, January 1988: Displaced Workers
	Current Population Survey, January 1986: Displaced Workers
4	Midlife in the United States (MIDUS 1), 1995-1996
	Midlife in the United States (MIDUS 3), 2013-2014
	Midlife in the United States (MIDUS 2), 2004-2006
5	Pittsburgh Youth Study Youngest Sample (1987 - 2001) [Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania]
	Pittsburgh Youth Study Middle Sample (1987 - 1991) [Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania]
	Pittsburgh Youth Study Oldest Sample (1987 - 2000) [Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania]
6	Historical, Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: The United States, 1790-1970
	Historical, Demographic, Economic, and Social Data: The United States, 1790-2002
	Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS)
7	National Health Interview Survey, 1994
	National Health Interview Survey, 1992
	National Health Interview Survey, 1993
8	National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (NSHAP): Round 2 and Partner Data Collection, [United States], 2010-2011
	National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (NSHAP): Round 3 and COVID-19 Study, [United States], 2015-2016, 2020-2021
	National Social Life, Health, and Aging Project (NSHAP): Round 1, [United States], 2005-2006
9	Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey), 2016
	Population Assessment of Tobacco and Health (PATH) Study [United States] Public-Use Files
	Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey), 2015
10	RETA: Chicago School Staff Social Network Questionnaire Longitudinal Study, 2005-2008
	RETA: Chicago School Staff Social Network Questionnaire Qualitative Interviews, 2006
	RETA: Lincoln School Staff Social Network Questionnaire Longitudinal Study, 2007-2008

**Topic atypicality:**

10 random example of top 25% quantile topic atypicality and bottom 25% quantile topic atypicality

10 Random draw of paper with 75% quantile topic atypicality (high novelty)		
paper	dataset title	dataset topics
1	Intergenerational Study of Parents and Children, 1962-1993: [Detroit]	career-expectations,children,demographic-characteristics,divorce,economic-behavior,education,employment,families,family-life,life-events,life-plans,marriage,mothers,parent-child-relationship,parental-attitudes,parenting-skills,parents,reproductive-history,social-attitudes,social-behavior,social-indicators,values,young-adults
	Detroit Area Study, 1962: Family Growth in Detroit	birth-control,cities,economic-behavior,family-background,family-life,family-planning,family-size,mothers,parental-attitudes,reproductive-history,social-attitudes,women
	National Survey of Families and Households, Wave 1: 1987-1988, [United States]	adoption,child-custody,child-support,divorce,education,families,family-life,family-relationships,family-structure,fertility,financial-assets,household-composition,income,job-history,life-events,life-history,living-arrangements,marital-relationships,parental-attitudes,psychological-wellbeing,social-contact,stepfamilies,wages-and-salaries
2	Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment, 1987-1989	arrest-records,arrests,deterrence,domestic-assault,domestic-violence,imprisonment,police-response,recidivism,victims,womens-shelters
	Spouse Abuse Replication Project in Metro-Dade County, Florida, 1987-1989	battered-women,counseling,domestic-violence,police-response,program-evaluation,recidivists,spouse-abuse,treatment-outcomes,treatment-programs,victims,victims-services
	Specific Deterrent Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault: Minneapolis, 1981-1982	arrests,assault,crime,crime-prevention,demographic-characteristics,drug-law-offenses,ethnicity,violence
	Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 1984 Panel: Health-Wealth Merged File	demographic-characteristics,disabilities,economic-conditions,energy-consumption,families,financial-assets,government-programs,health-insurance,households,housing-conditions,income,income-distribution,labor-force,participation,pensions,physical-disabilities,poverty-programs,public-assistance-programs,unearned-income,wages-and-salaries,wealth,welfare-services

3	<p>Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) [1984 Panel]</p> <p>Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 1984 Full Panel Research File</p>	<p>census-data,child-care,child-support,demographic-characteristics,disabilities,economic-conditions,educational-background,energy-assistance,families,financial-assets,financial-support,government-programs,health-expenditures,health-insurance,health-services-utilization,higher-education,households,housing-costs,income,income-distribution,job-history,labor-force,participation,pensions,poverity-programs,property,public-assistance-programs,public-housing,retirement,school-attendance,unearned-income,vehicles,wages-and-salaries,wealth,welfare-services</p> <p>demographic-characteristics,disabilities,economic-conditions,families,financial-assets,government-programs,households,income,income-distribution,labor-force,participation,poverity-programs,public-assistance-programs,unearned-income,unemployment,wages-and-salaries,wealth,welfare-services,working-hours</p>
4	<p>American Community Survey (ACS): Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), 2006</p> <p>American Community Survey (ACS): Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), 2007</p> <p>American Community Survey, 2008-2012 [United States]: Public Use Microdata Sample: Artist Extract</p>	<p>census-data,citizenship,demographic-characteristics,economic-conditions,employment,ethnicity,families,genealogy,hearing-impairment,household-composition,households,housing,housing-conditions,immigration,income,indigenous-populations,labor-force,marriage,military-service,mortgage-payments,physical-disabilities,population,population-characteristics,population-migration,public-utilities,race,taxes,vision-impairment</p> <p>census-data,citizenship,demographic-characteristics,economic-conditions,employment,ethnicity,families,genealogy,hearing-impairment,household-composition,households,housing,housing-conditions,immigration,income,indigenous-populations,labor-force,marriage,military-service,mortgage-payments,physical-disabilities,population,population-characteristics,population-migration,public-utilities,race,taxes,vision-impairment</p> <p>art-institutions,artists,arts,arts-attendance,arts-funding,arts-participation,community-organizations,demographic-characteristics</p>
	<p>High School and Beyond, 1980: Sophomore and Senior Cohort First Follow-Up (1982)</p>	<p>academic-achievement,aspirations,career-expectations,education-costs,educational-environment,educational-programs,expectations,family-background,friendships,goals,high-school-students,job-history,life-plans,marital-status,occupational-mobility,parent-child-relationship,parental-attitudes,peer-influence,postsecondary-education,religious-beliefs,secondary-education,self-concept,socialization,student-attitudes,student-behavior,teacher-attitudes,test-scores,values,work-experience</p>

5	National Education Longitudinal Study, 1988: Second Follow-Up (1992)	adolescents,academic-achievement,aspirations,career-goals,cognitive-functioning,curriculum, decision-making,educational-testing,educational-trends,family-background,educational-environment,educational-opportunities,high-school-students,home-environment,job-history,junior-high-school-students,learning,parental-influence,post-secondary-education,school-attendance, school-dropouts,secondary-education,self-concept,socioeconomic-status,student-participation, teacher-student-relationship,teachers,test-scores,work-environment
	National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972	academic-achievement,career-goals,ethnicity,family-background,family-life,higher-education,high-school-graduates,high-school-students,income,job-history,life-events,life-plans,marital-status, postsecondary-education,work-experience
6	Charlotte [North Carolina] Spouse Assault Replication Project, 1987-1989	arrests,battered-women,criminal-histories,deterrence,domestic-violence,intervention-strategies, misdemeanor-offenses,police-records,police-response,recidivism,spouse-abuse,victims
	Evaluating Alternative Police Responses to Spouse Assault in Colorado Springs: an Enhanced Replication of the Minneapolis Experiment, 1987-1989	arrests,counseling,crisis-intervention,domestic-assault,intervention,intervention-strategies,police-intervention,police-response,recidivism,spouse-abuse,victims
	Domestic Violence Experience in Omaha, Nebraska, 1986-1987	arrests,crime-reporting,deterrence,domestic-assault,domestic-violence,recidivism,treatment,victims
	Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, 2000	census-data,correctional-facilities-(adults),corrections,corrections-management,inmate-deaths, inmate-populations,inmate-programs,inmates,jails,prison-administration,prison-conditions,prison-construction,prison-overcrowding
	Survey of Inmates in State and Federal Correctional Facilities, [United States], 2004	correctional-facilities,correctional-facilities-(adults),corrections,criminal-histories,drug-abuse,HIV, inmate-classification,inmate-deaths,inmate-populations,inmate-programs,inmates,offenses,prison-conditions,substance-abuse,treatment-programs



7	National Study of Innovative and Promising Programs for Women Offenders, 1994-1995	child-abuse,correctional-facilities,female-inmates,female-offenders,inmate-programs,job-training,needs-assessment,parenting-skills,prerelease-programs,program-evaluation,self-esteem,substance-abuse,treatment-outcomes,treatment-programs
8	European Communities Studies, 1973-1984: Cumulative File	developing-nations,economic-integration,energy-policy,European-Economic-Community,European-Parliament,European-unification,European-Union,foreign-aid,income-distribution,life-satisfaction,military-strength,national-interests,nuclear-energy,political-attitudes,political-participation,political-party-preference,pollution,public-opinion,quality-of-life,religious-beliefs,social-attitudes,terrorism,voter-preferences
	Euro-barometer 21: Political Cleavages in the European Community, April 1984	attitudes,consumer-attitudes,consumer-behavior,consumer-expectations,economic-integration,European-unification,European-Union,government-spending,life-satisfaction,nationalism,political-influence,public-opinion,purchasing,quality-of-life,social-change
	International Financial Statistics	balance-of-payments,exchange-rates,financial-policy,government-expenditures,government-revenues,interest-rates,international-economics,monetary-reserves,trade
9	Survey of Disability and Work, 1978: [United States]	accessibility-(for-disabled),disabilities,disability-income,disabled-persons,government-programs,medical-care,physical-limitations,work,work-environment
	National Health Interview Survey, 1979	chronic-disabilities,chronic-illnesses,disabilities,doctor-visits,families,health,health-care,health-care-services,health-problems,home-care,hospitalization,household-composition,illness,public-health
	Health Interview Survey, 1976	chronic-disabilities,chronic-illnesses,disabilities,doctor-visits,families,health,health-care,health-care-services,health-problems,hospitalization,household-composition,illness
	Patterns of Behavior in Police and Citizen Transactions: Boston, Chicago, and Washington, DC, 1966	arrest-procedures,citizen-attitudes,police-citizen-interactions,police-effectiveness,police-performance,police-response

10	<p>Attitudes and Perceptions of Police Officers in Boston, Chicago, and Washington, DC, 1966</p>	<p>career-choice, career-expectations, job-satisfaction, perceptions, police-community-relations, police-officers, work-attitudes</p>
	<p>Survey of Victimization and Attitudes Towards Crime and Law Enforcement in Boston and Chicago, 1966</p>	<p>citizen-attitudes, crime-reporting, demographic-characteristics, fear-of-crime, neighborhoods, perception-of-crime, police-citizen-interactions, police-effectiveness, police-response, public-interest, public-opinion, victimization, victims</p>

<b>10 Random draw of paper with 25% quantile topic atypicality (low novelty)</b>		
<b>paper</b>	<b>dataset title</b>	<b>dataset topics</b>
1	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II, 1976-1980: Hematology and Biochemistry	demographic-characteristics,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition, populations,risk-factors,social-indicators
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II, 1976-1980: 24-Hour Recall, Specific Food Item	demographic-characteristics,diet,disease,eating-habits,ethnicity,health-behavior, health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II, 1976-1980: Total Nutrient Intake, Food Frequency, and Other Related Dietary Data	demographic-characteristics,diet,disease,eating-habits,ethnicity,food-preferences,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status, hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition,populations,risk-factors
2	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest, 2012	arrests,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,law-enforcement, offenses,Uniform-Crime-Reports
	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Offenses Known and Clearances by Arrest, 2007	arrests,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,law-enforcement, offenses,Uniform-Crime-Reports
	Census of State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies (CSLLEA), 2008	census-data,law-enforcement, personnel,police-departments,police-officers

	ANES 1984 Time Series Study	candidates,congressional-elections,domestic-policy,economic-conditions,foreign-policy,government-performance,information-sources,national-elections,political-affiliation,political-attitudes,political-campaigns,political-efficacy,political-issues,political-participation,presidential-elections,public-approval,public-opinion,public-policy,Reagan-Administration-(1981-1989),special-interest-groups,trust-in-government,voter-expectations,voter-history,voter-preferences,voting-behavior
	ANES 1990 Time Series Study	Bush-Administration-(1989-1993),candidates,congressional-elections,domestic-policy,economic-conditions,foreign-policy,government-performance,international-relations,national-elections,political-affiliation,political-attitudes,political-campaigns,political-efficacy,political-issues,political-participation,presidential-elections,presidential-performance,public-approval,public-opinion,trust-in-government,voter-expectations,voter-history,voting-behavior
	American National Election Study: 1990-1991 Panel Study of the Political Consequences of War/1991 Pilot Study	candidates,congressional-elections,domestic-policy,economic-conditions,foreign-policy,gender-roles,government-performance,Medicare,national-elections,Persian-Gulf-War,philanthropy,political-affiliation,political-attitudes,political-awareness,political-campaigns,political-efficacy,political-issues,political-participation,presidential-elections,public-approval,public-opinion,Social-Security,trust-in-government,voter-expectations,voter-history,voting-behavior
3	Correlates of War Project: International and Civil War Data, 1816-1992	armed-conflict,civil-wars,international-conflict,military-intervention,military-strength,population,power,war,war-deaths,world-wars
	Polity II: Political Structures and Regime Change, 1800-1986	military-regimes,political-change,political-systems
	Polity III: Regime Type and Political Authority, 1800-1994	military-regimes,political-change,political-systems
4	Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, 2000	census-data,correctional-facilities-(adults),corrections,corrections-management,inmate-deaths,inmate-populations,inmate-programs,inmates,jails,prison-administration,prison-conditions,prison-construction,prison-overcrowding

5	State Court Processing Statistics, 1990-2009: Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties	case-processing,court-cases,criminal-histories,defendants,disposition-(legal),felons,felony-courts,pretrial-detention,pretrial-release,sentencing,state-courts,statistical-data
	National Prisoner Statistics, 1978-2016	correctional-system,demographic-characteristics,HIV,offenders,parole,prison-inmates,state-correctional-facilities
6	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: County Level Arrest and Offenses Data, 1977-1983	arrests,arson,assault,auto-theft,burglary,counties,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,larceny,law-enforcement,murder,offenses,rape,robbery,Uniform-Crime-Reports
	Uniform Crime Reports: County Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, 1985 and 1987	arrests,arson,assault,auto-theft,burglary,counties,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,drug-abuse,fraud,illegal-gambling,larceny,law-enforcement,murder,offenses,rape,robbery,sex-offenses,Uniform-Crime-Reports,vandalism,weapons-offenses
	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: Property Stolen and Recovered, 1966-1976	arrests,assault,auto-theft,burglary,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,homicide,larceny,law-enforcement,offenses,rape,robbery,Uniform-Crime-Reports,violent-crime,weapons-offenses
7	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II, 1976-1980: Medical History Ages 12-74 Years	demographic-characteristics,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,medical-history,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III, 1988-1994	demographic-characteristics,diet,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey I, 1971-1975: Medical History	demographic-characteristics,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators

	National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2008	addiction,alcohol,alcohol-abuse,alcohol-consumption,amphetamines,barbiturates,cocaine,controlled-drugs,crack-cocaine,demographic-characteristics,depression-(psychology),drinking-behavior,drug-abuse,drug-dependence,drug-treatment,drug-use,drugs,employment,hallucinogens,health-care,heroin,households,income,inhalants,marijuana,mental-health,mental-health-services,methamphetamine,pregnancy,prescription-drugs,sedatives,smoking,stimulants,substance-abuse,substance-abuse-treatment,tobacco-use,tranquilizers,youths
	National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2010	addiction,alcohol,alcohol-abuse,alcohol-consumption,amphetamines,barbiturates,cocaine,controlled-drugs,crack-cocaine,demographic-characteristics,depression-(psychology),drinking-behavior,drug-abuse,drug-dependence,drug-treatment,drug-use,drugs,employment,hallucinogens,health-care,heroin,households,income,inhalants,marijuana,mental-health,mental-health-services,methamphetamine,pregnancy,prescription-drugs,sedatives,smoking,stimulants,substance-abuse,substance-abuse-treatment,tobacco-use,tranquilizers,youths
	National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2009	addiction,alcohol,alcohol-abuse,alcohol-consumption,amphetamines,barbiturates,cocaine,controlled-drugs,crack-cocaine,demographic-characteristics,depression-(psychology),drinking-behavior,drug-abuse,drug-dependence,drug-treatment,drug-use,drugs,employment,hallucinogens,health-care,heroin,households,income,inhalants,marijuana,mental-health,mental-health-services,methamphetamine,pregnancy,prescription-drugs,sedatives,smoking,stimulants,substance-abuse,substance-abuse-treatment,tobacco-use,tranquilizers,youths
8	Uniform Crime Reports [United States]: Supplementary Homicide Reports, 1976-1994	arrests,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,homicide,law-enforcement,offenders,offenses,Uniform-Crime-Reports,victims
	Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data [United States]: 1975-1997	arrest-records,arrests,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,homicide,justifiable-homicide,larceny,law-enforcement,offenders,offenses,police-deaths,police-officers,stolen-property,Uniform-Crime-Reports
	Uniform Crime Reports [United States]: Supplementary Homicide Reports, 1976-1997	arrests,crime-rates,crime-reporting,crime-statistics,homicide,law-enforcement,offenders,offenses,Uniform-Crime-Reports,victims
9		

10	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II, 1976-1980: Medical History Ages 12-74 Years	demographic-characteristics,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,medical-history,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey III, 1988-1994	demographic-characteristics,diet,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators
	National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey I, 1971-1975: Medical History	demographic-characteristics,disease,ethnicity,health-behavior,health-services-utilization,health-status,hospitalization,malnutrition,medical-evaluation,nutrition,populations,risk-factors,social-indicators

### 3. Variables Description

**Number of datasets:** The total number of datasets used in a paper. A publication needs to significantly utilize the datasets to produce results to be counted, as opposed to brief or tangential references [52].

**3 year citation impact of paper:** We utilize the OpenAlex API to extract all papers that have cited the targeted paper within a 3-year timeframe, starting from its publication year.

**5% hit paper:** We define a “5% hit paper” as a paper that has received citations within the top 5% of all papers in our dataset, based on their citation count over a 3-year period.

**Publication year:** The year of publication is significantly associated with citation rates. Therefore, in order to control for potential time effects, we incorporate the year variable as dummy variables. Each dummy variable corresponds to a five-year interval, allowing us to effectively account for the impact of time on citation patterns.




Figure S 5: Distribution of 3 year citation

**Dataset use frequency:** A paper utilizing a frequently used dataset may focus on popular research questions, which could potentially confound the citation analysis. To address this concern, we introduce dataset use frequency as a controlling variable when investigating its impact on citation rates. In cases where a paper incorporates multiple datasets, we calculate the average frequency at which each dataset is utilized within the paper.

**Number of authors:** Research on team science suggests that the number of co-authors is positively associated with citation impact, as a larger number of co-authors tends to result in a more extensive citation network.

**Author Recognition:** Author recognition can serve as a proxy for experience and authority in the field. Moreover, this variable has a strong correlation with citation impact. In this study, we assess author recognition by calculating the average number of citations received by the authors of a given paper.



**Disciplines:** In this study, we adopt the notion of Level 0 disciplines as provided by the Openalex dataset. Each paper in the dataset is associated with one or more discipline labels, and the weights for these labels are derived using deep learning models. The 19 major disciplines considered in the analysis are sociology, psychology, political science, physics, philosophy, medicine, mathematics, material science, history, geology, geography, environmental science, engineering, economics, computer science, chemistry, business, biology, and art.

**Impact Factor of Journal:** The majority of journals in our dataset do not have a public recorded impact factor. To address this limitation, we employ an alternative approach by calculating the average citation count for papers published in these journals during the year 2019. This average citation count is used as a proxy for the impact factor of the journal.

**Paper novelty (Atypicality of reference’s journal combination):** We assess the atypicality of reference combination employing the Sterling index [37], a general-purpose tool for measuring atypicality. Prior studies have utilized the Sterling index to quantify atypicality in the combination of references’ journal or multidisciplinary contexts [38,39]. Papers that use commonly combined reference’s journal represent typical papers, whereas those combining seldom associated ’s journal depict novel or atypical reference combinations. The Sterling index varies from 0 to 1, with higher values denoting greater atypicality.

## 4. Regression Tables

The full regression table is presented in Table 1 to Table 33.

(1) **The effect of dataset combinations on scientific impact:- Impact of using multiple datasets (using data combinations) on citation over 3, 5, 10 year(Table 1-3).**

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
<b>Intercept</b>	-2.7475	0.028	-99.895	0.000	-2.801	-2.694
<b>binary UsingMultipleDataset</b>	0.2197	0.003	75.747	0.000	0.214	0.225
<b>Data use frequency(log)</b>	0.0492	0.001	61.196	0.000	0.048	0.051
<b>NumAuthor</b>	0.0276	0.000	96.397	0.000	0.027	0.028
<b>AuthorExprience(log)</b>	0.4091	0.001	341.456	0.000	0.407	0.411
<b>ImpactFactor(log)</b>	0.4503	0.002	207.277	0.000	0.446	0.455
<b>Art</b>	-0.7981	0.157	-5.084	0.000	-1.106	-0.490
<b>Biology</b>	-1.0346	0.033	-31.451	0.000	-1.099	-0.970
<b>Business</b>	-0.1333	0.019	-6.920	0.000	-0.171	-0.096
<b>Chemistry</b>	0.4076	0.036	11.365	0.000	0.337	0.478
<b>Computer_science</b>	0.4604	0.021	21.425	0.000	0.418	0.503
<b>Economics</b>	0.3351	0.014	24.578	0.000	0.308	0.362
<b>Engineering</b>	-0.3978	0.054	-7.322	0.000	-0.504	-0.291
<b>Environmental_science</b>	1.7511	0.039	44.433	0.000	1.674	1.828
<b>Geography</b>	-0.3756	0.020	-18.493	0.000	-0.415	-0.336
<b>Geology</b>	-0.7238	0.222	-3.261	0.001	-1.159	-0.289
<b>History</b>	-0.9133	0.089	-10.302	0.000	-1.087	-0.740
<b>Materials_science</b>	-1.7100	0.407	-4.205	0.000	-2.507	-0.913
<b>Mathematics</b>	0.2039	0.028	7.379	0.000	0.150	0.258
<b>Medicine</b>	0.5839	0.010	58.530	0.000	0.564	0.603
<b>Philosophy</b>	0.3109	0.116	2.675	0.007	0.083	0.539
<b>Physics</b>	0.6722	0.126	5.352	0.000	0.426	0.918
<b>Political_science</b>	0.2422	0.014	17.654	0.000	0.215	0.269
<b>Psychology</b>	-0.0519	0.010	-5.334	0.000	-0.071	-0.033
<b>Sociology</b>	0.3856	0.015	25.722	0.000	0.356	0.415
<b>1974, 1979</b>	0.1374	0.029	4.705	0.000	0.080	0.195
<b>1979, 1984</b>	-0.2165	0.028	-7.699	0.000	-0.272	-0.161
<b>1984, 1989</b>	-0.0826	0.026	-3.127	0.002	-0.134	-0.031
<b>1989, 1994</b>	0.1791	0.025	7.077	0.000	0.129	0.229
<b>1994, 1999</b>	0.6874	0.025	28.002	0.000	0.639	0.736
<b>1999, 2004</b>	0.8155	0.024	33.369	0.000	0.768	0.863
<b>2004, 2009</b>	0.8505	0.024	34.863	0.000	0.803	0.898
<b>2009, 2014</b>	0.6496	0.024	26.616	0.000	0.602	0.697
<b>2014, 2020</b>	0.5258	0.024	21.509	0.000	0.478	0.574
<b>No. Observations:</b>	30366	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-5.0561e+05			
<b>Df Residuals:</b>	30332	<b>Df Model:</b>	33			
<b>Deviance:</b>	8.9371e+05	<b>Pearson chi2:</b>	2.70e+06			

Table S 1: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable. The results show that using multiple datasets is associated with a 22% increase in 3-Year Citations.

Dep. Variable: 5 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
<b>Intercept</b>	-1.2852	0.023	-55.693	0.000	-1.330	-1.240
<b>binary UsingMultipleDataset</b>	0.1539	0.003	58.957	0.000	0.149	0.159
<b>Data use frequency(log)</b>	0.0389	0.001	56.480	0.000	0.038	0.040
<b>NumAuthor</b>	0.0211	0.000	67.469	0.000	0.020	0.022
<b>AuthorExprience(log)</b>	0.3186	0.001	311.465	0.000	0.317	0.321
<b>ImpactFactor(log)</b>	0.3640	0.002	192.990	0.000	0.360	0.368
<b>Art</b>	-0.7803	0.131	-5.974	0.000	-1.036	-0.524
<b>Biology</b>	-0.7382	0.028	-25.926	0.000	-0.794	-0.682
<b>Business</b>	-0.2115	0.016	-12.918	0.000	-0.244	-0.179
<b>Chemistry</b>	0.1866	0.033	5.614	0.000	0.121	0.252
<b>Computer_science</b>	0.3092	0.019	16.085	0.000	0.272	0.347
<b>Economics</b>	0.2830	0.012	24.137	0.000	0.260	0.306
<b>Engineering</b>	-0.1653	0.046	-3.626	0.000	-0.255	-0.076
<b>Environmental_science</b>	1.0098	0.040	25.002	0.000	0.931	1.089
<b>Geography</b>	-0.2437	0.017	-14.283	0.000	-0.277	-0.210
<b>Geology</b>	-0.4126	0.188	-2.195	0.028	-0.781	-0.044
<b>History</b>	-0.8108	0.073	-11.088	0.000	-0.954	-0.668
<b>Materials_science</b>	-0.4554	0.317	-1.437	0.151	-1.077	0.166
<b>Mathematics</b>	-0.3393	0.026	-13.104	0.000	-0.390	-0.289
<b>Medicine</b>	0.4128	0.009	47.290	0.000	0.396	0.430
<b>Philosophy</b>	0.3227	0.096	3.359	0.001	0.134	0.511
<b>Physics</b>	1.2021	0.100	12.040	0.000	1.006	1.398
<b>Political_science</b>	0.0622	0.012	5.329	0.000	0.039	0.085
<b>Psychology</b>	-0.0535	0.008	-6.294	0.000	-0.070	-0.037
<b>Sociology</b>	0.3062	0.013	24.280	0.000	0.281	0.331
<b>1974, 1979</b>	0.0061	0.025	0.242	0.809	-0.043	0.055
<b>1979, 1984</b>	-0.1383	0.023	-5.908	0.000	-0.184	-0.092
<b>1984, 1989</b>	-0.0098	0.022	-0.446	0.656	-0.053	0.033
<b>1989, 1994</b>	0.1956	0.021	9.212	0.000	0.154	0.237
<b>1994, 1999</b>	0.5945	0.021	28.822	0.000	0.554	0.635
<b>1999, 2004</b>	0.7950	0.020	38.781	0.000	0.755	0.835
<b>2004, 2009</b>	0.8808	0.020	43.073	0.000	0.841	0.921
<b>2009, 2014</b>	0.7441	0.020	36.396	0.000	0.704	0.784
<b>2014, 2020</b>	0.6283	0.021	30.516	0.000	0.588	0.669
<b>No. Observations:</b>	27099	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-4.3479e+05			
<b>Df Residuals:</b>	27065	<b>Df Model:</b>	33			
<b>Deviance:</b>	7.5235e+05	<b>Pearson chi2:</b>	1.71e+06			

Table S 2: Results of the Poisson regression table with 5-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable. The results show that using multiple datasets is associated with a 15% increase in 3-Year Citations. To capture 5-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2018 for this analysis.

Dep. Variable: 10 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-0.6815	0.016	-41.526	0.000	-0.714	-0.649
binary UsingMultipleDataset	0.1504	0.002	73.114	0.000	0.146	0.154
Data use frequency(log)	0.0469	0.001	88.141	0.000	0.046	0.048
NumAuthor	0.0419	0.000	117.849	0.000	0.041	0.043
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3621	0.001	444.072	0.000	0.361	0.364
ImpactFactor(log)	0.2981	0.001	217.426	0.000	0.295	0.301
Art	-0.5721	0.094	-6.112	0.000	-0.756	-0.389
Biology	-1.2346	0.022	-55.212	0.000	-1.278	-1.191
Business	-0.3985	0.013	-30.558	0.000	-0.424	-0.373
Chemistry	0.1425	0.023	6.083	0.000	0.097	0.188
Computer_science	0.1758	0.015	11.756	0.000	0.147	0.205
Economics	0.2306	0.009	26.718	0.000	0.214	0.248
Engineering	-0.6921	0.039	-17.936	0.000	-0.768	-0.616
Environmental_science	1.3456	0.029	47.020	0.000	1.289	1.402
Geography	-0.3086	0.013	-23.255	0.000	-0.335	-0.283
Geology	-0.0610	0.141	-0.433	0.665	-0.338	0.215
History	-0.7625	0.051	-14.939	0.000	-0.863	-0.662
Materials_science	-0.7998	0.384	-2.083	0.037	-1.552	-0.047
Mathematics	0.0013	0.019	0.067	0.946	-0.036	0.038
Medicine	0.1474	0.007	22.162	0.000	0.134	0.160
Philosophy	0.2225	0.067	3.339	0.001	0.092	0.353
Physics	0.8489	0.085	10.035	0.000	0.683	1.015
Political_science	0.0117	0.009	1.359	0.174	-0.005	0.028
Psychology	-0.0163	0.007	-2.493	0.013	-0.029	-0.003
Sociology	0.3678	0.009	40.345	0.000	0.350	0.386
1974, 1979	-0.0937	0.018	-5.353	0.000	-0.128	-0.059
1979, 1984	-0.2308	0.016	-14.178	0.000	-0.263	-0.199
1984, 1989	-0.0151	0.015	-0.995	0.320	-0.045	0.015
1989, 1994	0.2806	0.015	19.227	0.000	0.252	0.309
1994, 1999	0.7030	0.014	49.384	0.000	0.675	0.731
1999, 2004	0.8460	0.014	59.672	0.000	0.818	0.874
2004, 2009	0.8168	0.014	57.666	0.000	0.789	0.845
2009, 2014	0.6302	0.014	44.285	0.000	0.602	0.658
No. Observations:	19565	Log-Likelihood:	-7.0562e+05			
Df Residuals:	19532	Df Model:	32			
Deviance:	1.3100e+06	Pearson chi2:	2.84e+06			

Table S 3: Results of the Poisson regression table with 10-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable. The results show that using multiple datasets is associated with a 15% increase in 10-Year Citations. To capture 10-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2013 for this analysis.

Tables 4 - 7 present the effects of using multiple dataset (data combination) on citations, based on a three-year analysis of publications released in four distinct time periods: before 1990, 1990-2000, 2000-2010, and 2010-2020.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.5993	0.020	-80.091	0.000	-1.638	-1.560
binary UsingMultipleDataset	0.2494	0.004	58.626	0.000	0.241	0.258
Data use frequency(log)	0.0199	0.001	16.081	0.000	0.017	0.022
NumAuthor	0.0215	0.000	51.089	0.000	0.021	0.022
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3319	0.002	189.542	0.000	0.328	0.335
ImpactFactor(log)	0.5927	0.004	155.499	0.000	0.585	0.600
Art	-0.2598	0.253	-1.026	0.305	-0.756	0.237
Biology	-0.8674	0.047	-18.648	0.000	-0.959	-0.776
Business	-0.0578	0.028	-2.052	0.040	-0.113	-0.003
Chemistry	0.0213	0.063	0.338	0.735	-0.102	0.144
Computer_science	0.3820	0.032	12.102	0.000	0.320	0.444
Economics	0.3558	0.024	14.908	0.000	0.309	0.403
Engineering	0.1694	0.069	2.445	0.014	0.034	0.305
Environmental_science	-0.4740	0.093	-5.106	0.000	-0.656	-0.292
Geography	-0.5325	0.030	-17.627	0.000	-0.592	-0.473
Geology	-0.1124	0.403	-0.279	0.781	-0.903	0.678
History	-1.1710	0.170	-6.875	0.000	-1.505	-0.837
Materials_science	-1.1174	0.486	-2.299	0.022	-2.070	-0.165
Mathematics	-0.5977	0.047	-12.681	0.000	-0.690	-0.505
Medicine	0.3664	0.016	23.573	0.000	0.336	0.397
Philosophy	0.4069	0.290	1.404	0.160	-0.161	0.975
Physics	-0.7937	0.223	-3.562	0.000	-1.230	-0.357
Political_science	0.3325	0.024	14.108	0.000	0.286	0.379
Psychology	-0.1245	0.015	-8.466	0.000	-0.153	-0.096
Sociology	0.3916	0.026	15.271	0.000	0.341	0.442
No. Observations:	14705	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-1.9782e+05			
Df Residuals:	14679	<b>Df Model:</b>	25			
Deviance:	3.3968e+05	<b>Pearson chi2:</b>	1.02e+06			

Table S 4: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable for paper published between 2010 and 2020.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-2.8696	0.020	-140.519	0.000	-2.910	-2.830
binary UsingMultipleDataset	0.3278	0.004	77.533	0.000	0.320	0.336
Data use frequency(log)	0.0680	0.001	57.684	0.000	0.066	0.070
NumAuthor	0.0507	0.001	83.210	0.000	0.049	0.052
AuthorExprience(log)	0.5255	0.002	282.144	0.000	0.522	0.529
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3822	0.003	130.855	0.000	0.376	0.388
Art	-3.2169	0.275	-11.690	0.000	-3.756	-2.678
Biology	-1.9846	0.049	-40.588	0.000	-2.080	-1.889
Business	-0.4030	0.032	-12.588	0.000	-0.466	-0.340
Chemistry	0.3855	0.045	8.602	0.000	0.298	0.473
Computer_science	0.5521	0.033	16.526	0.000	0.487	0.618
Economics	0.4159	0.021	19.365	0.000	0.374	0.458
Engineering	-1.7110	0.099	-17.219	0.000	-1.906	-1.516
Environmental_science	2.6763	0.044	60.421	0.000	2.589	2.763
Geography	-0.7585	0.032	-23.898	0.000	-0.821	-0.696
Geology	1.2022	0.279	4.314	0.000	0.656	1.748
History	-1.3570	0.156	-8.710	0.000	-1.662	-1.052
Materials_science	-30.2787	3.673	-8.244	0.000	-37.477	-23.080
Mathematics	0.5864	0.040	14.696	0.000	0.508	0.665
Medicine	0.4286	0.015	28.690	0.000	0.399	0.458
Philosophy	2.3551	0.169	13.976	0.000	2.025	2.685
Physics	2.2358	0.181	12.380	0.000	1.882	2.590
Political_science	0.3147	0.022	14.427	0.000	0.272	0.357
Psychology	-0.1773	0.015	-11.938	0.000	-0.206	-0.148
Sociology	0.3438	0.024	14.525	0.000	0.297	0.390
No. Observations:	10299	Log-Likelihood:	-2.4564e+05			
Df Residuals:	10273	Df Model:	25			
Deviance:	4.4993e+05	Pearson chi2:	1.22e+06			

Table S 5: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable for paper published between 2000 and 2010.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-3.7332	0.034	-109.848	0.000	-3.800	-3.667
binary UsingMultipleDataset	0.1411	0.008	17.673	0.000	0.125	0.157
Data use frequency(log)	0.1273	0.002	56.220	0.000	0.123	0.132
NumAuthor	0.0694	0.002	42.746	0.000	0.066	0.073
AuthorExprience(log)	0.4306	0.003	142.325	0.000	0.425	0.437
ImpactFactor(log)	0.6062	0.005	118.780	0.000	0.596	0.616
Art	0.8904	0.270	3.294	0.001	0.361	1.420
Biology	0.4074	0.086	4.713	0.000	0.238	0.577
Business	0.1727	0.045	3.850	0.000	0.085	0.261
Chemistry	0.8022	0.124	6.479	0.000	0.560	1.045
Computer_science	0.6777	0.055	12.391	0.000	0.570	0.785
Economics	0.7600	0.029	26.397	0.000	0.704	0.816
Engineering	-0.1597	0.158	-1.008	0.313	-0.470	0.151
Environmental_science	1.7341	0.186	9.342	0.000	1.370	2.098
Geography	0.6188	0.053	11.722	0.000	0.515	0.722
Geology	-2.1956	0.511	-4.295	0.000	-3.198	-1.194
History	0.1470	0.165	0.890	0.373	-0.177	0.471
Materials_science	1.5184	1.001	1.517	0.129	-0.444	3.481
Mathematics	0.4465	0.069	6.443	0.000	0.311	0.582
Medicine	1.3813	0.024	57.640	0.000	1.334	1.428
Philosophy	-0.8591	0.263	-3.262	0.001	-1.375	-0.343
Physics	3.0929	0.223	13.846	0.000	2.655	3.531
Political_science	0.7404	0.029	25.277	0.000	0.683	0.798
Psychology	0.4200	0.024	17.224	0.000	0.372	0.468
Sociology	0.6812	0.032	21.129	0.000	0.618	0.744
No. Observations:	4994	Log-Likelihood:	-87491.			
Df Residuals:	4968	Df Model:	25			
Deviance:	1.5785e+05	Pearson chi2:	5.06e+05			

Table S 6: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable for paper published between 1990 and 2000.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.2257	0.057	-21.673	0.000	-1.337	-1.115
binary UsingMultipleDataset	0.0255	0.016	1.608	0.108	-0.006	0.057
Data use frequency(log)	-0.0249	0.004	-6.067	0.000	-0.033	-0.017
NumAuthor	0.0958	0.006	15.173	0.000	0.083	0.108
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3161	0.005	64.861	0.000	0.307	0.326
ImpactFactor(log)	0.2748	0.009	29.975	0.000	0.257	0.293
Art	-1.3671	0.775	-1.764	0.078	-2.886	0.152
Biology	0.3344	0.178	1.876	0.061	-0.015	0.684
Business	-0.3997	0.090	-4.451	0.000	-0.576	-0.224
Chemistry	1.5099	0.188	8.029	0.000	1.141	1.878
Computer_science	-0.8659	0.098	-8.875	0.000	-1.057	-0.675
Economics	0.3343	0.049	6.764	0.000	0.237	0.431
Engineering	-1.6837	0.273	-6.179	0.000	-2.218	-1.150
Environmental_science	-2.4969	0.497	-5.019	0.000	-3.472	-1.522
Geography	0.4517	0.087	5.204	0.000	0.282	0.622
Geology	-2.6760	1.333	-2.008	0.045	-5.288	-0.064
History	-0.7268	0.204	-3.565	0.000	-1.126	-0.327
Materials_science	-0.7081	0.751	-0.943	0.346	-2.179	0.763
Mathematics	-0.0998	0.102	-0.975	0.330	-0.300	0.101
Medicine	-0.0120	0.049	-0.246	0.806	-0.108	0.084
Philosophy	-0.8907	0.269	-3.310	0.001	-1.418	-0.363
Physics	0.6643	0.349	1.904	0.057	-0.019	1.348
Political_science	-0.3159	0.045	-6.990	0.000	-0.404	-0.227
Psychology	0.2292	0.043	5.353	0.000	0.145	0.313
Sociology	0.0270	0.050	0.536	0.592	-0.072	0.125
No. Observations:	2695	Log-Likelihood:	-17287.			
Df Residuals:	2669	Df Model:	25			
Deviance:	26479.	Pearson chi2:	4.33e+04			

Table S 7: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Using multiple datasets (1 indicates using more than one dataset in the publication, 0 otherwise) as independent variable for paper published before 1990.

Alternative Robustness check: Impact of number of datasets used on citation over 3, 5, 10 year. (Table 8-10)

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-2.7251	0.027	-99.142	0.000	-2.779	-2.671
NumDatasets	0.0089	0.000	48.705	0.000	0.009	0.009
Data use frequency(log)	0.0464	0.001	58.483	0.000	0.045	0.048
NumAuthor	0.0270	0.000	94.000	0.000	0.026	0.028
AuthorExprience(log)	0.4112	0.001	343.487	0.000	0.409	0.414
ImpactFactor(log)	0.4537	0.002	208.933	0.000	0.449	0.458
Art	-0.6858	0.157	-4.360	0.000	-0.994	-0.378
Biology	-1.0741	0.033	-32.736	0.000	-1.138	-1.010
Business	-0.1537	0.019	-7.972	0.000	-0.191	-0.116
Chemistry	0.4184	0.036	11.669	0.000	0.348	0.489
Computer_science	0.4348	0.022	20.214	0.000	0.393	0.477
Economics	0.3315	0.014	24.264	0.000	0.305	0.358
Engineering	-0.4853	0.055	-8.892	0.000	-0.592	-0.378
Environmental_science	1.7763	0.040	44.916	0.000	1.699	1.854
Geography	-0.3629	0.020	-17.860	0.000	-0.403	-0.323
Geology	-0.7848	0.222	-3.529	0.000	-1.221	-0.349
History	-0.8487	0.088	-9.591	0.000	-1.022	-0.675
Materials_science	-1.5624	0.404	-3.869	0.000	-2.354	-0.771
Mathematics	0.2206	0.028	7.988	0.000	0.166	0.275
Medicine	0.6028	0.010	60.418	0.000	0.583	0.622
Philosophy	0.3251	0.116	2.801	0.005	0.098	0.553
Physics	0.6058	0.125	4.836	0.000	0.360	0.851
Political_science	0.2689	0.014	19.584	0.000	0.242	0.296
Psychology	-0.0805	0.010	-8.289	0.000	-0.100	-0.061
Sociology	0.3778	0.015	25.183	0.000	0.348	0.407
1974, 1979	0.1568	0.029	5.368	0.000	0.100	0.214
1979, 1984	-0.2063	0.028	-7.339	0.000	-0.261	-0.151
1984, 1989	-0.0675	0.026	-2.555	0.011	-0.119	-0.016
1989, 1994	0.1929	0.025	7.625	0.000	0.143	0.243
1994, 1999	0.7005	0.025	28.542	0.000	0.652	0.749
1999, 2004	0.8131	0.024	33.276	0.000	0.765	0.861
2004, 2009	0.8739	0.024	35.838	0.000	0.826	0.922
2009, 2014	0.6744	0.024	27.642	0.000	0.627	0.722
2014, 2020	0.5457	0.024	22.332	0.000	0.498	0.594
No. Observations:	30366	Log-Likelihood:	-5.0561e+05			
Df Model:	33	Df Residuals:	30332			
Pearson chi2:	2.77e+06	Deviance:	8.9762e+05			

Table S 8: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and number of dataset used as independent variable. The results show that using one more dataset is associated with a 1% increase in 3-Year Citations.



Dep. Variable: 5 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.2719	0.023	-55.138	0.000	-1.317	-1.227
NumDatasets	0.0050	0.000	25.341	0.000	0.005	0.005
Data use frequency(log)	0.0363	0.001	53.195	0.000	0.035	0.038
NumAuthor	0.0208	0.000	66.236	0.000	0.020	0.021
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3206	0.001	313.596	0.000	0.319	0.323
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3668	0.002	194.489	0.000	0.363	0.371
Art	-0.6998	0.131	-5.349	0.000	-0.956	-0.443
Biology	-0.7715	0.028	-27.127	0.000	-0.827	-0.716
Business	-0.2274	0.016	-13.887	0.000	-0.260	-0.195
Chemistry	0.1954	0.033	5.880	0.000	0.130	0.260
Computer_science	0.2889	0.019	15.022	0.000	0.251	0.327
Economics	0.2878	0.012	24.503	0.000	0.265	0.311
Engineering	-0.2033	0.046	-4.450	0.000	-0.293	-0.114
Environmental_science	1.0203	0.040	25.200	0.000	0.941	1.100
Geography	-0.2343	0.017	-13.726	0.000	-0.268	-0.201
Geology	-0.4590	0.188	-2.437	0.015	-0.828	-0.090
History	-0.7790	0.073	-10.669	0.000	-0.922	-0.636
Materials_science	-0.2671	0.315	-0.847	0.397	-0.885	0.351
Mathematics	-0.3243	0.026	-12.532	0.000	-0.375	-0.274
Medicine	0.4274	0.009	48.975	0.000	0.410	0.444
Philosophy	0.3125	0.096	3.254	0.001	0.124	0.501
Physics	1.1659	0.100	11.704	0.000	0.971	1.361
Political_science	0.0779	0.012	6.676	0.000	0.055	0.101
Psychology	-0.0766	0.008	-9.034	0.000	-0.093	-0.060
Sociology	0.3002	0.013	23.798	0.000	0.275	0.325
1974, 1979]]	0.0203	0.025	0.805	0.421	-0.029	0.070
979, 1984	-0.1295	0.023	-5.533	0.000	-0.175	-0.084
1984, 1989	0.0024	0.022	0.111	0.912	-0.041	0.046
1989, 1994	0.2064	0.021	9.726	0.000	0.165	0.248
994, 1999	0.6053	0.021	29.350	0.000	0.565	0.646
1999, 2004	0.7964	0.020	38.851	0.000	0.756	0.837
2004, 2009	0.8983	0.020	43.944	0.000	0.858	0.938
2009, 2014	0.7636	0.020	37.359	0.000	0.724	0.804
2014, 2020	0.6477	0.021	31.467	0.000	0.607	0.688
No. Observations:	27099	Log-Likelihood:	-4.3623e+05			
Df Model:	33	Df Residuals:	27065			
Pearson chi2:	1.75e+06	Deviance:	7.5523e+05			

Table S 9: Results of the Poisson regression table with 5-Year Citations as the dependent variable and number of dataset used as independent variable. The results show that using one more dataset is associated with a 1% increase in 5-Year Citations. To capture 5-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2018 for this analysis.

Dep. Variable: 10 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-0.6641	0.016	-40.488	0.000	-0.696	-0.632
NumDatasets	0.0040	0.000	22.553	0.000	0.004	0.004
Data use frequency(log)	0.0436	0.001	82.803	0.000	0.043	0.045
numauthor	0.0414	0.000	116.432	0.000	0.041	0.042
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3638	0.001	446.591	0.000	0.362	0.365
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3016	0.001	219.886	0.000	0.299	0.304
Art	-0.4967	0.094	-5.294	0.000	-0.681	-0.313
Biology	-1.2774	0.022	-57.183	0.000	-1.321	-1.234
Business	-0.4114	0.013	-31.546	0.000	-0.437	-0.386
Chemistry	0.1352	0.023	5.768	0.000	0.089	0.181
Computer_science	0.1490	0.015	9.957	0.000	0.120	0.178
Economics	0.2420	0.009	28.009	0.000	0.225	0.259
Engineering	-0.7161	0.039	-18.530	0.000	-0.792	-0.640
Environmental_science	1.3530	0.029	47.202	0.000	1.297	1.409
Geography	-0.2990	0.013	-22.524	0.000	-0.325	-0.273
Geology	-0.1811	0.141	-1.284	0.199	-0.458	0.095
History	-0.7488	0.051	-14.697	0.000	-0.849	-0.649
Materials_science	-0.4629	0.368	-1.259	0.208	-1.184	0.258
Mathematics	0.0212	0.019	1.118	0.263	-0.016	0.058
Medicine	0.1616	0.007	24.317	0.000	0.149	0.175
Philosophy	0.2186	0.067	3.284	0.001	0.088	0.349
Physics	0.8942	0.084	10.604	0.000	0.729	1.059
Political_science	0.0287	0.009	3.349	0.001	0.012	0.046
Psychology	-0.0436	0.007	-6.683	0.000	-0.056	-0.031
Sociology	0.3629	0.009	39.800	0.000	0.345	0.381
1974, 1979	-0.0803	0.018	-4.585	0.000	-0.115	-0.046
1979, 1984	-0.2220	0.016	-13.641	0.000	-0.254	-0.190
1984, 1989	-0.0033	0.015	-0.214	0.831	-0.033	0.027
1989, 1994	0.2915	0.015	19.976	0.000	0.263	0.320
1994, 1999	0.7141	0.014	50.172	0.000	0.686	0.742
1999, 2004	0.8496	0.014	59.935	0.000	0.822	0.877
2004, 2009	0.8365	0.014	59.082	0.000	0.809	0.864
2009, 2014	0.6556	0.014	46.083	0.000	0.628	0.683
No. Observations:	19565	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-7.0803e+05			
Df Model:	32	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	19532			
Pearson chi2:	2.90e+06	<b>Deviance:</b>	1.3149e+06			

Table S 10: Results of the Poisson regression table with 10-Year Citations as the dependent variable and number of dataset used as independent variable. The results show that using one more dataset is associated with a 0.4% increase in 10-Year Citations. To capture 10-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2013 for this analysis.

(2) Atypical combinations of datasets associate with high impact: - Impact of using atypical combinations of datasets on citation over 3, 5, 10 year. (Table 11-13)

Dep. Variable:3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-4.3594	0.061	-71.903	0.000	-4.478	-4.241
Paper novelty	0.0550	0.003	15.839	0.000	0.048	0.062
Atypicality of datasets	0.3215	0.005	65.195	0.000	0.312	0.331
Data use frequency(log)	0.1376	0.002	69.178	0.000	0.134	0.141
NumAuthor	0.0724	0.001	116.115	0.000	0.071	0.074
AuthorExprience(log)	0.4329	0.002	201.810	0.000	0.429	0.437
ImpactFactor(log)	0.4419	0.004	121.090	0.000	0.435	0.449
NumDatasets	-0.0022	0.000	-6.051	0.000	-0.003	-0.001
Art	0.3109	0.219	1.420	0.156	-0.118	0.740
Biology	0.3438	0.059	5.802	0.000	0.228	0.460
Business	0.3959	0.033	11.879	0.000	0.331	0.461
Chemistry	0.4922	0.062	7.974	0.000	0.371	0.613
Computer_science	-0.4798	0.046	-10.486	0.000	-0.569	-0.390
Economics	0.8035	0.024	34.088	0.000	0.757	0.850
Engineering	0.1481	0.103	1.440	0.150	-0.053	0.350
Environmental_science	0.2071	0.090	2.306	0.021	0.031	0.383
Geography	-0.0271	0.034	-0.801	0.423	-0.093	0.039
Geology	0.9256	0.406	2.281	0.023	0.130	1.721
History	-1.0323	0.160	-6.444	0.000	-1.346	-0.718
Materials_science	-0.7044	0.533	-1.322	0.186	-1.748	0.340
Mathematics	1.8077	0.041	43.678	0.000	1.727	1.889
Medicine	0.9180	0.017	53.210	0.000	0.884	0.952
Philosophy	-0.5977	0.239	-2.501	0.012	-1.066	-0.129
Physics	0.4930	0.261	1.892	0.059	-0.018	1.004
Political_science	0.5703	0.024	23.854	0.000	0.523	0.617
Psychology	0.3149	0.017	18.314	0.000	0.281	0.349
Sociology	0.7462	0.028	26.666	0.000	0.691	0.801
1974, 1979	0.0134	0.063	0.213	0.831	-0.110	0.137
1979, 1984	-0.1972	0.061	-3.250	0.001	-0.316	-0.078
1984, 1989	-0.2019	0.058	-3.464	0.001	-0.316	-0.088
1989, 1994	-0.0128	0.057	-0.226	0.821	-0.124	0.098
1994, 1999	0.6417	0.055	11.568	0.000	0.533	0.750
1999, 2004	0.6260	0.055	11.279	0.000	0.517	0.735
2004, 2009	0.8274	0.055	14.935	0.000	0.719	0.936
2009, 2014	0.4945	0.055	8.914	0.000	0.386	0.603
2014, 2020	0.3720	0.056	6.690	0.000	0.263	0.481
No. Observations:	8881	Log-Likelihood:	-1.9460e+05			
Df Residuals:	8845	Df Model:	35			
Pearson chi2:	9.54e+05	Deviance:	3.5493e+05			

Table S 11: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Atypicality of Data Combinations as independent variable. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 32% increase in 3-Year Citations.

Dep. Variable: 5 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-2.5849	0.052	-49.681	0.000	-2.687	-2.483
Paper novelty	0.0545	0.003	18.185	0.000	0.049	0.060
Atypicality of datasets	0.2647	0.005	57.307	0.000	0.256	0.274
Data use frequency(log)	0.1036	0.002	59.321	0.000	0.100	0.107
NumAuthor	0.0490	0.001	67.884	0.000	0.048	0.050
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3443	0.002	183.405	0.000	0.341	0.348
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3474	0.003	108.216	0.000	0.341	0.354
NumDatasets	-0.0066	0.000	-17.132	0.000	-0.007	-0.006
Art	0.0218	0.184	0.119	0.905	-0.339	0.382
Biology	0.4009	0.053	7.597	0.000	0.297	0.504
Business	0.2149	0.029	7.459	0.000	0.158	0.271
Chemistry	0.4319	0.056	7.699	0.000	0.322	0.542
Computer_science	-0.0773	0.039	-1.975	0.048	-0.154	-0.001
Economics	0.6627	0.021	32.010	0.000	0.622	0.703
Engineering	0.2233	0.086	2.597	0.009	0.055	0.392
Environmental_science	0.1861	0.080	2.323	0.020	0.029	0.343
Geography	0.0859	0.028	3.029	0.002	0.030	0.142
Geology	0.5550	0.351	1.582	0.114	-0.133	1.243
History	-0.4823	0.126	-3.840	0.000	-0.728	-0.236
Materials_science	0.2145	0.341	0.630	0.529	-0.453	0.882
Mathematics	0.4291	0.043	10.051	0.000	0.345	0.513
Medicine	0.7357	0.015	47.829	0.000	0.706	0.766
Philosophy	0.6872	0.185	3.719	0.000	0.325	1.049
Physics	1.3395	0.213	6.293	0.000	0.922	1.757
Political_science	0.3213	0.021	15.590	0.000	0.281	0.362
Psychology	0.2090	0.015	13.647	0.000	0.179	0.239
Sociology	0.5556	0.024	23.074	0.000	0.508	0.603
1974, 1979	-0.0478	0.055	-0.877	0.380	-0.155	0.059
1979, 1984	-0.0986	0.052	-1.914	0.056	-0.200	0.002
1984, 1989	-0.0649	0.049	-1.311	0.190	-0.162	0.032
1989, 1994	0.1617	0.048	3.350	0.001	0.067	0.256
1994, 1999	0.6082	0.047	12.827	0.000	0.515	0.701
1999, 2004	0.6673	0.047	14.074	0.000	0.574	0.760
2004, 2009	0.8432	0.047	17.815	0.000	0.750	0.936
2009, 2014	0.6393	0.047	13.493	0.000	0.546	0.732
2014, 2020	0.5167	0.048	10.856	0.000	0.423	0.610
No. Observations:	7783	Log-Likelihood:	-1.6670e+05			
Df Model:	35	Df Residuals:	7524			
Pearson chi2:	7.15e+05	Deviance:	2.9787e+05			

Table S 12: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations on 5-Year Citations. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 26% increase in 5-Year Citations. *Note:* This study serves as a robustness test. To capture 5-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2018 for this analysis.

Dep. Variable: 10 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.7011	0.036	-47.891	0.000	-1.771	-1.631
Paper novelty	0.1085	0.002	45.077	0.000	0.104	0.113
Atypicality of datasets	0.2849	0.004	77.401	0.000	0.278	0.292
Data use frequency(log)	0.0882	0.001	64.758	0.000	0.085	0.091
NumAuthor	0.0860	0.001	124.167	0.000	0.085	0.087
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3824	0.002	249.336	0.000	0.379	0.385
ImpactFactor(log)	0.2621	0.002	114.047	0.000	0.258	0.267
NumDatasets	-0.0120	0.000	-33.432	0.000	-0.013	-0.011
Art	0.5650	0.123	4.578	0.000	0.323	0.807
Biology	0.4638	0.041	11.421	0.000	0.384	0.543
Business	0.0107	0.023	0.466	0.641	-0.034	0.056
Chemistry	0.5027	0.041	12.191	0.000	0.422	0.584
Computer_science	-0.6530	0.033	-20.005	0.000	-0.717	-0.589
Economics	0.5450	0.015	35.313	0.000	0.515	0.575
Engineering	-0.1029	0.073	-1.411	0.158	-0.246	0.040
Environmental_science	-0.0595	0.064	-0.935	0.350	-0.184	0.065
Geography	-0.1090	0.022	-4.865	0.000	-0.153	-0.065
Geology	1.1190	0.369	3.033	0.002	0.396	1.842
History	-1.0919	0.102	-10.748	0.000	-1.291	-0.893
Materials_science	-0.1871	0.440	-0.425	0.671	-1.050	0.676
Mathematics	1.0780	0.029	36.629	0.000	1.020	1.136
Medicine	0.4044	0.012	33.770	0.000	0.381	0.428
Philosophy	0.3254	0.129	2.525	0.012	0.073	0.578
Physics	3.0672	0.146	20.981	0.000	2.781	3.354
Political_science	0.1489	0.015	9.691	0.000	0.119	0.179
Psychology	0.1664	0.012	13.752	0.000	0.143	0.190
Sociology	0.7244	0.017	41.425	0.000	0.690	0.759
1974, 1979	-0.2107	0.036	-5.791	0.000	-0.282	-0.139
1979, 1984	-0.3051	0.034	-8.882	0.000	-0.372	-0.238
1984, 1989	-0.2161	0.033	-6.600	0.000	-0.280	-0.152
1989, 1994	0.0634	0.032	1.993	0.046	0.001	0.126
1994, 1999	0.5536	0.031	17.718	0.000	0.492	0.615
1999, 2004	0.5745	0.031	18.369	0.000	0.513	0.636
2004, 2009	0.5799	0.031	18.537	0.000	0.519	0.641
2009, 2014	0.3309	0.031	10.541	0.000	0.269	0.392
No. Observations:	5518	Log-Likelihood:	-2.5487e+05			
Df Model:	34	Df Residuals:	5483			
Pearson chi2:	1.03e+06	Deviance:	4.8079e+05			

Table S 13: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations on 10-Year Citations. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 28% increase in 10-Year Citations. *Note:* This study serves as a robustness test. To capture 10-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2013 for this analysis.

- Tables 14-17 present the effects of using atypical combinations of datasets on citations, based on a three-year analysis of publications released in four distinct time periods: before 1990, 1990-2000, 2000-2010, and 2010-2020.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-4.2901	0.039	-108.750	0.000	-4.367	-4.213
Paper novelty	0.0781	0.006	13.510	0.000	0.067	0.089
Atypicality of datasets	0.3713	0.007	53.776	0.000	0.358	0.385
Data use frequency(log)	0.1347	0.003	44.558	0.000	0.129	0.141
NumAuthor	0.0543	0.001	65.872	0.000	0.053	0.056
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3906	0.003	130.977	0.000	0.385	0.396
ImpactFactor(log)	0.7208	0.006	117.299	0.000	0.709	0.733
NumDatasets	0.0011	0.000	3.101	0.002	0.000	0.002
Art	0.0236	0.394	0.060	0.952	-0.749	0.796
Biology	-0.4040	0.092	-4.415	0.000	-0.583	-0.225
Business	0.2929	0.048	6.158	0.000	0.200	0.386
Chemistry	-0.5078	0.092	-5.547	0.000	-0.687	-0.328
Computer_science	0.2923	0.061	4.786	0.000	0.173	0.412
Economics	1.2012	0.040	30.099	0.000	1.123	1.279
Engineering	0.7644	0.127	6.027	0.000	0.516	1.013
Environmental_science	-0.0848	0.144	-0.590	0.555	-0.367	0.197
Geography	-0.3905	0.053	-7.348	0.000	-0.495	-0.286
Geology	1.8139	0.545	3.330	0.001	0.746	2.882
History	-0.0923	0.236	-0.390	0.696	-0.555	0.371
Materials_science	-0.7990	0.843	-0.947	0.344	-2.452	0.854
Mathematics	-0.5627	0.082	-6.834	0.000	-0.724	-0.401
Medicine	0.8554	0.026	33.490	0.000	0.805	0.905
Philosophy	-2.0613	0.749	-2.754	0.006	-3.529	-0.594
Physics	-1.3571	0.501	-2.707	0.007	-2.340	-0.374
Political_science	0.9716	0.041	23.935	0.000	0.892	1.051
Psychology	0.2434	0.025	9.853	0.000	0.195	0.292
Sociology	0.6768	0.047	14.330	0.000	0.584	0.769
No. Observations:	4663	Log-Likelihood:	-84860.			
Df Model:	26	Df Residuals:	4636			
Pearson chi2:	3.61e+05	Deviance:	1.5142e+05			

Table S 14: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations on 3-Year Citations for paper published between 2010 to 2020.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-5.9333	0.040	-146.676	0.000	-6.013	-5.854
Paper novelty	-0.0069	0.005	-1.382	0.167	-0.017	0.003
Atypicality of datasets	0.5409	0.007	73.293	0.000	0.526	0.555
Data use frequency(log)	0.1645	0.003	55.547	0.000	0.159	0.170
NumAuthor	0.1106	0.001	97.572	0.000	0.108	0.113
AuthorExprience(log)	0.6042	0.003	177.609	0.000	0.598	0.611
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3741	0.005	79.761	0.000	0.365	0.383
NumDatasets	-0.0247	0.001	-31.085	0.000	-0.026	-0.023
Art	-3.8217	0.442	-8.648	0.000	-4.688	-2.956
Biology	0.1266	0.096	1.316	0.188	-0.062	0.315
Business	0.4126	0.057	7.224	0.000	0.301	0.525
Chemistry	1.1241	0.084	13.364	0.000	0.959	1.289
Computer_science	-0.6370	0.080	-7.933	0.000	-0.794	-0.480
Economics	1.1949	0.037	32.169	0.000	1.122	1.268
Engineering	-1.7206	0.206	-8.350	0.000	-2.125	-1.317
Environmental_science	0.0997	0.149	0.671	0.502	-0.192	0.391
Geography	0.0199	0.051	0.387	0.699	-0.081	0.121
Geology	15.6892	1.131	13.868	0.000	13.472	17.907
History	-3.2420	0.299	-10.841	0.000	-3.828	-2.656
Materials_science	-26.4480	4.941	-5.352	0.000	-36.133	-16.763
Mathematics	3.2368	0.051	63.060	0.000	3.136	3.337
Medicine	1.3272	0.026	50.197	0.000	1.275	1.379
Philosophy	3.8550	0.419	9.190	0.000	3.033	4.677
Physics	6.1148	0.373	16.411	0.000	5.384	6.845
Political_science	0.9561	0.038	24.889	0.000	0.881	1.031
Psychology	0.5550	0.027	20.484	0.000	0.502	0.608
Sociology	1.5093	0.046	32.696	0.000	1.419	1.600
No. Observations:	2810	Log-Likelihood:	-99248.			
Df Model:	26	Df Residuals:	2783			
Pearson chi2:	4.97e+05	Deviance:	1.8680e+05			

Table S 15: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations on 3-Year Citations for paper published between 2000 to 2010.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-2.5988	0.067	-38.643	0.000	-2.731	-2.467
Paper novelty	0.3920	0.010	39.465	0.000	0.373	0.411
Atypicality of datasets	0.0763	0.015	5.000	0.000	0.046	0.106
Data use frequency(log)	0.1718	0.006	29.506	0.000	0.160	0.183
NumAuthor	0.0341	0.005	6.399	0.000	0.024	0.045
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3881	0.006	68.900	0.000	0.377	0.399
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3407	0.009	37.799	0.000	0.323	0.358
NumDatasets	-0.0047	0.002	-2.982	0.003	-0.008	-0.002
Art	-0.1024	0.296	-0.346	0.729	-0.682	0.477
Biology	5.3751	0.133	40.372	0.000	5.114	5.636
Business	0.0524	0.077	0.679	0.497	-0.099	0.204
Chemistry	-2.2936	0.453	-5.063	0.000	-3.182	-1.406
Computer_science	-0.5853	0.124	-4.720	0.000	-0.828	-0.342
Economics	0.4847	0.054	8.908	0.000	0.378	0.591
Engineering	-2.3758	0.415	-5.719	0.000	-3.190	-1.562
Environmental_science	0.5461	0.238	2.292	0.022	0.079	1.013
Geography	0.6989	0.080	8.697	0.000	0.541	0.856
Geology	-5.4165	1.145	-4.729	0.000	-7.661	-3.172
History	-1.0739	0.428	-2.507	0.012	-1.913	-0.234
Materials_science	7.4941	1.724	4.346	0.000	4.114	10.874
Mathematics	-1.9569	0.156	-12.547	0.000	-2.263	-1.651
Medicine	0.7242	0.046	15.741	0.000	0.634	0.814
Philosophy	-1.4593	0.536	-2.724	0.006	-2.509	-0.409
Physics	-1.2409	0.499	-2.486	0.013	-2.219	-0.263
Political_science	0.0080	0.052	0.154	0.878	-0.094	0.110
Psychology	-0.0531	0.047	-1.123	0.262	-0.146	0.040
Sociology	0.1601	0.058	2.784	0.005	0.047	0.273
No. Observations:	1369	Log-Likelihood:	-22386.			
Df Model:	26	Df Residuals:	1342			
Pearson chi2:	8.77e+04	Deviance:	39949.			

Table S 16: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations on 3-Year Citations for paper published between 1990 to 2000.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.7434	0.137	-12.756	0.000	-2.011	-1.476
Paper novelty	0.1369	0.012	11.276	0.000	0.113	0.161
Atypicality of datasets	0.2132	0.036	5.961	0.000	0.143	0.283
Data use frequency(log)	0.0435	0.011	3.844	0.000	0.021	0.066
NumAuthor	-0.0080	0.016	-0.498	0.618	-0.039	0.023
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3130	0.010	32.532	0.000	0.294	0.332
ImpactFactor(log)	0.1827	0.019	9.717	0.000	0.146	0.220
NumDatasets	-0.0142	0.005	-3.017	0.003	-0.023	-0.005
Art	-21.0434	11.637	-1.808	0.071	-43.851	1.764
Biology	1.1870	0.499	2.378	0.017	0.209	2.166
Business	-0.5877	0.200	-2.939	0.003	-0.980	-0.196
Chemistry	8.3031	0.533	15.582	0.000	7.259	9.347
Computer_science	-0.4287	0.185	-2.316	0.021	-0.791	-0.066
Economics	1.0440	0.097	10.802	0.000	0.855	1.233
Engineering	-4.0208	0.775	-5.187	0.000	-5.540	-2.501
Environmental_science	-2.6882	1.053	-2.554	0.011	-4.751	-0.625
Geography	-0.0532	0.183	-0.291	0.771	-0.412	0.306
Geology	2.873e-13	1.59e-13	1.812	0.070	-2.35e-14	5.98e-13
History	-1.5599	0.400	-3.900	0.000	-2.344	-0.776
Materials_science	-0.0359	0.761	-0.047	0.962	-1.527	1.455
Mathematics	0.1253	0.213	0.589	0.556	-0.292	0.542
Medicine	0.2546	0.099	2.570	0.010	0.060	0.449
Philosophy	1.1241	0.407	2.763	0.006	0.327	1.922
Physics	-2.7459	1.156	-2.375	0.018	-5.012	-0.480
Political_science	0.1006	0.086	1.174	0.241	-0.067	0.269
Psychology	0.3487	0.084	4.134	0.000	0.183	0.514
Sociology	-0.1810	0.100	-1.808	0.071	-0.377	0.015
No. Observations:	721	Log-Likelihood:	-4241.8			
Df Model:	25	Df Residuals:	695			
Pearson chi2:	9.25e+03	Deviance:	6271.3			

Table S 17: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations on 3-Year Citations for paper published before 1990.

Impact of using atypical combinations of datasets on broader scientific impact - Wikipedia, Policy, News, and Twitter mentions.(Table 18 - 21)



Dep. Variable: Wikipedia	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-7.9476	0.758	-10.486	0.000	-9.433	-6.462
Paper novelty	0.2754	0.042	6.547	0.000	0.193	0.358
Atypicality of datasets	0.4912	0.052	9.458	0.000	0.389	0.593
Data use frequency(log)	-0.0595	0.021	-2.826	0.005	-0.101	-0.018
NumAuthor	-0.0072	0.013	-0.539	0.590	-0.033	0.019
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3108	0.023	13.648	0.000	0.266	0.355
ImpactFactor(log)	0.5293	0.041	12.869	0.000	0.449	0.610
NumDatasets	0.0059	0.002	2.573	0.010	0.001	0.010
Art	0.0907	1.631	0.056	0.956	-3.106	3.288
Biology	0.9624	0.619	1.555	0.120	-0.250	2.175
Business	-1.1196	0.346	-3.232	0.001	-1.799	-0.441
Chemistry	0.8967	0.701	1.279	0.201	-0.478	2.271
Computer_science	-1.0078	0.439	-2.296	0.022	-1.868	-0.147
Economics	0.0019	0.219	0.009	0.993	-0.428	0.432
Engineering	1.2291	0.763	1.611	0.107	-0.266	2.724
Environmental_science	-0.1709	0.915	-0.187	0.852	-1.964	1.622
Geography	-2.0834	0.399	-5.226	0.000	-2.865	-1.302
Geology	3.4369	2.774	1.239	0.215	-2.000	8.874
History	0.0019	1.256	0.001	0.999	-2.460	2.464
Materials_science	-79.6453	6.648	-11.980	0.000	-92.675	-66.615
Mathematics	1.2745	0.466	2.736	0.006	0.361	2.188
Medicine	-0.5294	0.185	-2.856	0.004	-0.893	-0.166
Philosophy	-4.2729	2.748	-1.555	0.120	-9.658	1.112
Physics	-2.4721	2.616	-0.945	0.345	-7.600	2.656
Political_science	0.6118	0.210	2.910	0.004	0.200	1.024
Psychology	-0.7208	0.177	-4.082	0.000	-1.067	-0.375
Sociology	0.1720	0.248	0.694	0.488	-0.314	0.658
1974, 1979	1.0770	0.754	1.428	0.153	-0.401	2.555
1979, 1984	-0.0916	0.792	-0.116	0.908	-1.644	1.460
1984, 1989	0.7361	0.733	1.004	0.315	-0.701	2.173
1989, 1994	0.8325	0.724	1.150	0.250	-0.586	2.251
1994, 1999	1.6208	0.714	2.270	0.023	0.221	3.020
1999, 2004	1.8259	0.714	2.557	0.011	0.427	3.225
2004, 2009	1.5631	0.715	2.187	0.029	0.162	2.964
2009, 2014	1.0050	0.716	1.404	0.160	-0.398	2.408
2014, 2020	1.2881	0.716	1.799	0.072	-0.115	2.691
No. Observations:	8881	Log-Likelihood:	-4687.3			
Df Model:	35	Df Residuals:	8845			
Pearson chi2:	3.92e+04	Deviance:	7898.2			

Table S 18: Results of the Poisson regression table with number of Wikipedia mentions as the dependent variable and Atypicality of Data Combinations as independent variable. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 49% increase in Wikipedia mentions.

Dep. Variable: Policy	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-3.6058	0.195	-18.529	0.000	-3.987	-3.224
Paper novelty	0.0691	0.014	4.819	0.000	0.041	0.097
Atypicality of datasets	0.2335	0.024	9.848	0.000	0.187	0.280
Data use frequency(log)	-0.1289	0.009	-13.686	0.000	-0.147	-0.110
NumAuthor	0.0396	0.006	6.570	0.000	0.028	0.051
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3515	0.011	33.258	0.000	0.331	0.372
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3974	0.017	23.055	0.000	0.364	0.431
NumDatasets	-0.0007	0.001	-0.592	0.554	-0.003	0.002
Art	-4.2404	1.683	-2.519	0.012	-7.540	-0.941
Biology	1.9197	0.237	8.086	0.000	1.454	2.385
Business	0.7155	0.109	6.564	0.000	0.502	0.929
Chemistry	-0.3621	0.470	-0.770	0.441	-1.283	0.559
Computer_science	-0.3347	0.216	-1.548	0.122	-0.758	0.089
Economics	1.6275	0.097	16.798	0.000	1.438	1.817
Engineering	0.7990	0.412	1.938	0.053	-0.009	1.607
Environmental_science	-0.7441	0.429	-1.735	0.083	-1.585	0.097
Geography	0.1509	0.145	1.038	0.299	-0.134	0.436
Geology	-2.7330	2.387	-1.145	0.252	-7.412	1.946
History	0.6575	0.499	1.317	0.188	-0.321	1.636
Materials_science	-10.9997	6.077	-1.810	0.070	-22.911	0.912
Mathematics	-1.7670	0.283	-6.241	0.000	-2.322	-1.212
Medicine	-0.2742	0.087	-3.166	0.002	-0.444	-0.104
Philosophy	-6.5418	1.753	-3.731	0.000	-9.978	-3.105
Physics	-0.0594	1.169	-0.051	0.959	-2.350	2.232
Political_science	-1.5392	0.111	-13.871	0.000	-1.757	-1.322
Psychology	-0.2642	0.086	-3.089	0.002	-0.432	-0.097
Sociology	-0.6217	0.133	-4.691	0.000	-0.882	-0.362
1974, 1979	-0.3718	0.197	-1.888	0.059	-0.758	0.014
1979, 1984	-0.8496	0.183	-4.632	0.000	-1.209	-0.490
1984, 1989	-0.4159	0.165	-2.514	0.012	-0.740	-0.092
1989, 1994	-0.4142	0.161	-2.567	0.010	-0.730	-0.098
1994, 1999	0.0375	0.158	0.238	0.812	-0.272	0.347
1999, 2004	-0.1088	0.159	-0.686	0.492	-0.420	0.202
2004, 2009	-0.4644	0.160	-2.910	0.004	-0.777	-0.152
2009, 2014	-0.9718	0.160	-6.055	0.000	-1.286	-0.657
2014, 2020	-1.6053	0.164	-9.818	0.000	-1.926	-1.285
No. Observations:	8881	Log-Likelihood:	-13097.			
Df Model:	35	Df Residuals:	8845			
Pearson chi2:	4.89e+04	Deviance:	20655.			

Table S 19: Results of the Poisson regression table with number of Policy document mentions as the dependent variable and Atypicality of Data Combinations as independent variable. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 23% increase in Policy document mentions.

Dep. Variable: Twitter	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-4.2941	0.099	-43.404	0.000	-4.488	-4.100
Paper novelty	0.0414	0.005	7.659	0.000	0.031	0.052
Atypicality of datasets	0.7022	0.007	97.103	0.000	0.688	0.716
Data use frequency(log)	-0.1374	0.003	-43.620	0.000	-0.144	-0.131
NumAuthor	0.0510	0.001	51.045	0.000	0.049	0.053
AuthorExprience(log)	0.1751	0.003	62.307	0.000	0.170	0.181
ImpactFactor(log)	0.7504	0.006	117.913	0.000	0.738	0.763
NumDatasets	0.0089	0.000	33.004	0.000	0.008	0.009
Art	0.8759	0.288	3.046	0.002	0.312	1.440
Biology	0.5445	0.095	5.722	0.000	0.358	0.731
Business	-0.9448	0.044	-21.238	0.000	-1.032	-0.858
Chemistry	-2.7338	0.184	-14.883	0.000	-3.094	-2.374
Computer_science	-0.9568	0.062	-15.404	0.000	-1.079	-0.835
Economics	-0.6566	0.038	-17.342	0.000	-0.731	-0.582
Engineering	-0.8770	0.128	-6.866	0.000	-1.127	-0.627
Environmental_science	0.1001	0.117	0.854	0.393	-0.130	0.330
Geography	-0.4932	0.051	-9.669	0.000	-0.593	-0.393
Geology	-0.7570	0.484	-1.564	0.118	-1.706	0.192
History	3.6985	0.134	27.499	0.000	3.435	3.962
Materials_science	-5.9001	2.244	-2.629	0.009	-10.299	-1.501
Mathematics	-0.6095	0.100	-6.066	0.000	-0.806	-0.413
Medicine	-0.0283	0.027	-1.065	0.287	-0.080	0.024
Philosophy	0.5084	0.428	1.188	0.235	-0.330	1.347
Physics	-8.8850	0.646	-13.750	0.000	-10.151	-7.618
Political_science	1.8854	0.032	58.632	0.000	1.822	1.948
Psychology	-0.2122	0.025	-8.605	0.000	-0.261	-0.164
Sociology	-1.0493	0.040	-26.100	0.000	-1.128	-0.970
1974, 1979	-1.7856	0.175	-10.225	0.000	-2.128	-1.443
1979, 1984	-0.5658	0.112	-5.030	0.000	-0.786	-0.345
1984, 1989	-0.6214	0.106	-5.883	0.000	-0.828	-0.414
1989, 1994	-0.6102	0.102	-5.986	0.000	-0.810	-0.410
1994, 1999	-0.2630	0.096	-2.734	0.006	-0.452	-0.074
1999, 2004	0.0499	0.095	0.526	0.599	-0.136	0.236
2004, 2009	0.3253	0.093	3.486	0.000	0.142	0.508
2009, 2014	1.3825	0.092	15.001	0.000	1.202	1.563
2014, 2020	2.7403	0.092	29.791	0.000	2.560	2.921
No. Observations:	8881	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-1.4961e+05			
Df Model:	35	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	8845			
Pearson chi2:	1.69e+06	<b>Deviance:</b>	2.8640e+05			

Table S 20: Results of the Poisson regression table with number of Twitter mentions as the dependent variable and Atypicality of Data Combinations as independent variable. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 70% increase in Twitter mentions.

Dep. Variable: News mention	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-3.8531	0.152	-25.284	0.000	-4.152	-3.554
Paper novelty	-0.0987	0.009	-11.605	0.000	-0.115	-0.082
Atypicality of datasets	0.2911	0.013	22.100	0.000	0.265	0.317
Data use frequency(log)	-0.0159	0.006	-2.693	0.007	-0.027	-0.004
NumAuthor	0.0383	0.002	19.002	0.000	0.034	0.042
AuthorExprience(log)	0.1356	0.005	25.710	0.000	0.125	0.146
ImpactFactor(log)	0.5075	0.012	43.208	0.000	0.484	0.530
NumDatasets	0.0166	0.000	39.688	0.000	0.016	0.017
Art	0.2356	0.668	0.353	0.724	-1.074	1.546
Biology	2.6198	0.143	18.278	0.000	2.339	2.901
Business	-0.9265	0.108	-8.592	0.000	-1.138	-0.715
Chemistry	2.8442	0.152	18.722	0.000	2.546	3.142
Computer_science	-0.9359	0.148	-6.341	0.000	-1.225	-0.647
Economics	0.0171	0.083	0.208	0.835	-0.145	0.179
Engineering	1.1003	0.228	4.823	0.000	0.653	1.547
Environmental_science	1.5885	0.203	7.820	0.000	1.190	1.987
Geography	0.3666	0.102	3.578	0.000	0.166	0.567
Geology	-2.3412	1.208	-1.939	0.053	-4.708	0.026
History	1.5477	0.370	4.186	0.000	0.823	2.272
Materials_science	-81.4548	2.698	-30.188	0.000	-86.743	-76.166
Mathematics	0.4801	0.186	2.580	0.010	0.115	0.845
Medicine	1.7851	0.052	34.176	0.000	1.683	1.887
Philosophy	6.7036	0.607	11.037	0.000	5.513	7.894
Physics	-8.2348	1.566	-5.258	0.000	-11.304	-5.165
Political_science	1.6401	0.073	22.441	0.000	1.497	1.783
Psychology	0.5631	0.051	11.109	0.000	0.464	0.662
Sociology	-0.4950	0.092	-5.359	0.000	-0.676	-0.314
974, 1979	-2.1746	0.289	-7.513	0.000	-2.742	-1.607
1979, 1984	-2.7851	0.298	-9.355	0.000	-3.369	-2.202
1984, 1989	-2.4268	0.225	-10.776	0.000	-2.868	-1.985
1989, 1994	-0.7683	0.148	-5.181	0.000	-1.059	-0.478
1994, 1999	-0.9325	0.144	-6.477	0.000	-1.215	-0.650
1999, 2004	-0.1218	0.138	-0.883	0.377	-0.392	0.149
2004, 2009	0.0289	0.136	0.212	0.832	-0.238	0.296
2009, 2014	0.4175	0.135	3.082	0.002	0.152	0.683
2014, 2020	1.5811	0.135	11.697	0.000	1.316	1.846
No. Observations:	8881	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-52361.			
Df Model:	35	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	8845			
Pearson chi2:	4.95e+05	<b>Deviance:</b>	99273.			

Table S 21: Results of the Poisson regression table with number of News mentions as the dependent variable and Atypicality of Data Combinations as independent variable. The results show that one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations is associated with a 29% decrease in News mentions.

-Alternative Impact Quantification: We examined the impact of using atypical combinations of datasets on the likelihood of becoming top 5% hit papers – publications that received citations within the top 5% in our dataset.(Table 22)

Dep. Variable: top 5% hit paper (binary)	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-11.4285	1.186	-9.636	0.000	-13.753	-9.104
Paper novelty	0.3354	0.085	3.930	0.000	0.168	0.503
Atypicality of datasets	0.3927	0.098	4.015	0.000	0.201	0.584
Data use frequency(log)	0.1613	0.041	3.947	0.000	0.081	0.241
NumAuthor	0.0805	0.017	4.773	0.000	0.047	0.114
AuthorExprience(log)	0.5594	0.047	11.996	0.000	0.468	0.651
ImpactFactor(log)	0.5592	0.076	7.316	0.000	0.409	0.709
NumDatasets	0.0077	0.005	1.470	0.141	-0.003	0.018
Art	1.6101	3.464	0.465	0.642	-5.180	8.400
Biology	1.3109	1.068	1.228	0.220	-0.782	3.404
Business	-0.3643	0.728	-0.501	0.617	-1.790	1.062
Chemistry	1.6869	1.099	1.535	0.125	-0.467	3.841
Computer_science	-0.0325	0.935	-0.035	0.972	-1.866	1.801
Economics	1.0014	0.470	2.129	0.033	0.080	1.923
Engineering	0.7782	2.025	0.384	0.701	-3.191	4.747
Environmental_science	0.4132	1.688	0.245	0.807	-2.895	3.722
Geography	0.3084	0.641	0.481	0.630	-0.948	1.565
Geology	-341.6914	3.91e+05	-0.001	0.999	-7.66e+05	7.65e+05
History	-1.4400	3.584	-0.402	0.688	-8.464	5.584
Materials_science	-208.5084	3.32e+05	-0.001	0.999	-6.51e+05	6.51e+05
Mathematics	-0.8916	1.127	-0.791	0.429	-3.100	1.317
Medicine	0.6473	0.353	1.833	0.067	-0.045	1.339
Philosophy	-2.4573	6.195	-0.397	0.692	-14.600	9.685
Physics	7.7597	3.707	2.093	0.036	0.495	15.024
Political_science	0.0287	0.490	0.058	0.953	-0.933	0.990
Psychology	-0.0770	0.350	-0.220	0.826	-0.762	0.608
Sociology	0.7001	0.565	1.240	0.215	-0.406	1.807
1974, 1979	-1.3654	1.449	-0.942	0.346	-4.206	1.475
1979, 1984	-1.9777	1.445	-1.369	0.171	-4.810	0.855
1984, 1989	-1.4380	1.192	-1.206	0.228	-3.775	0.899
1989, 1994	-0.5431	1.083	-0.501	0.616	-2.666	1.580
1994, 1999	0.3408	1.054	0.323	0.747	-1.726	2.407
1999, 2004	0.5007	1.054	0.475	0.635	-1.565	2.566
2004, 2009	0.4232	1.054	0.401	0.688	-1.643	2.489
2009, 2014	-0.2723	1.057	-0.258	0.797	-2.343	1.799
2014, 2020	-0.4091	1.059	-0.386	0.699	-2.485	1.667
No. Observations:	8881	Log-Likelihood:	-1684.8			
Df Model:	35	Df Residuals:	8845			
Pearson chi2:	8.90e+03	Deviance:	3369.5			

Table S 22: Logistic regression model: investigating the impact of atypicality of data combinations on achieving top 5 percent hit paper status. This study serves as a robustness test. The hit paper variable is binary, with 1 indicating that the publication received citations in the top 5 percent among all the papers in our dataset, and 0 otherwise.

(3) The effect of atypical dataset topic combinations on scientific impact: - Impact of using atypical dataset topic combinations and atypical combinations of datasets on citation over 3, 5, 10 year. (Table 23-25)

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-4.2803	0.061	-70.466	0.000	-4.399	-4.161
Paper novelty	0.0636	0.004	18.130	0.000	0.057	0.070
Atypicality of datasets	0.3366	0.005	67.347	0.000	0.327	0.346
Topic atypicality	-0.0832	0.003	-25.656	0.000	-0.090	-0.077
Data use frequency(log)	0.1194	0.002	56.767	0.000	0.115	0.124
NumAuthor	0.0733	0.001	118.888	0.000	0.072	0.075
AuthorExprience(log)	0.4397	0.002	203.480	0.000	0.435	0.444
ImpactFactor(log)	0.4405	0.004	120.934	0.000	0.433	0.448
NumDatasets	-0.0024	0.000	-6.622	0.000	-0.003	-0.002
Art	0.3571	0.218	1.642	0.101	-0.069	0.783
Biology	0.3260	0.059	5.493	0.000	0.210	0.442
Business	0.3902	0.033	11.704	0.000	0.325	0.456
Chemistry	0.4657	0.062	7.545	0.000	0.345	0.587
Computer_science	-0.4823	0.046	-10.545	0.000	-0.572	-0.393
Economics	0.8239	0.024	34.943	0.000	0.778	0.870
Engineering	0.0316	0.103	0.308	0.758	-0.170	0.233
Environmental_science	0.2272	0.090	2.529	0.011	0.051	0.403
Geography	-0.0244	0.034	-0.724	0.469	-0.091	0.042
Geology	0.9024	0.410	2.201	0.028	0.099	1.706
History	-0.9833	0.160	-6.132	0.000	-1.298	-0.669
Materials_science	-0.5378	0.531	-1.013	0.311	-1.578	0.502
Mathematics	1.7861	0.041	43.093	0.000	1.705	1.867
Medicine	0.8823	0.017	51.078	0.000	0.848	0.916
Philosophy	-0.5537	0.238	-2.329	0.020	-1.020	-0.088
Physics	0.5045	0.261	1.935	0.053	-0.007	1.016
Political_science	0.5302	0.024	22.140	0.000	0.483	0.577
Psychology	0.3306	0.017	19.233	0.000	0.297	0.364
Sociology	0.7883	0.028	28.095	0.000	0.733	0.843
1974, 1979	0.0074	0.063	0.118	0.906	-0.116	0.131
1979, 1984	-0.1949	0.061	-3.211	0.001	-0.314	-0.076
1984, 1989	-0.2067	0.058	-3.546	0.000	-0.321	-0.092
1989, 1994	-0.0174	0.057	-0.307	0.759	-0.129	0.094
1994, 1999	0.6429	0.055	11.583	0.000	0.534	0.752
1999, 2004	0.6282	0.056	11.314	0.000	0.519	0.737
2004, 2009	0.8366	0.055	15.095	0.000	0.728	0.945
2009, 2014	0.5060	0.056	9.116	0.000	0.397	0.615
2014, 2020	0.3826	0.056	6.877	0.000	0.274	0.492
No. Observations:	8881	Log-Likelihood:	-1.9428e+05			
Df Residuals:	8844	Df Model:	36			
Pearson chi2:	9.48e+05	Deviance:	3.5429e+05			

Table S 23: Results of the Poisson regression table with 3-Year Citations as the dependent variable and Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality as independent variables. The results indicate that a one-standard-deviation increase in Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality is correlated with a 34% increase and a 8% decrease, respectively, in 3-Year Citations.

Dep. Variable: 5 year citation	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-2.5216	0.052	-48.344	0.000	-2.624	-2.419
Paper novelty	0.0588	0.003	19.522	0.000	0.053	0.065
Atypicality of datasets	0.2755	0.005	58.987	0.000	0.266	0.285
Topic atypicality	-0.0570	0.003	-18.943	0.000	-0.063	-0.051
Data use frequency(log)	0.0909	0.002	48.776	0.000	0.087	0.095
NumAuthor	0.0497	0.001	69.369	0.000	0.048	0.051
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3480	0.002	184.354	0.000	0.344	0.352
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3469	0.003	108.153	0.000	0.341	0.353
NumDatasets	-0.0068	0.000	-17.457	0.000	-0.008	-0.006
Art	0.0491	0.183	0.268	0.789	-0.310	0.408
Biology	0.3870	0.053	7.324	0.000	0.283	0.491
Business	0.2197	0.029	7.623	0.000	0.163	0.276
Chemistry	0.4189	0.056	7.472	0.000	0.309	0.529
Computer_science	-0.0811	0.039	-2.070	0.038	-0.158	-0.004
Economics	0.6711	0.021	32.416	0.000	0.631	0.712
Engineering	0.1579	0.086	1.839	0.066	-0.010	0.326
Environmental_science	0.1993	0.080	2.487	0.013	0.042	0.356
Geography	0.0893	0.028	3.151	0.002	0.034	0.145
Geology	0.5817	0.353	1.647	0.099	-0.110	1.274
History	-0.4454	0.126	-3.542	0.000	-0.692	-0.199
Materials_science	0.3115	0.340	0.917	0.359	-0.354	0.977
Mathematics	0.4171	0.043	9.762	0.000	0.333	0.501
Medicine	0.7139	0.015	46.337	0.000	0.684	0.744
Philosophy	0.6905	0.184	3.744	0.000	0.329	1.052
Physics	1.3365	0.213	6.278	0.000	0.919	1.754
Political_science	0.2945	0.021	14.263	0.000	0.254	0.335
Psychology	0.2201	0.015	14.365	0.000	0.190	0.250
Sociology	0.5825	0.024	24.132	0.000	0.535	0.630
1974, 1979	-0.0529	0.055	-0.969	0.332	-0.160	0.054
1979, 1984	-0.0983	0.052	-1.908	0.056	-0.199	0.003
1984, 1989	-0.0697	0.050	-1.407	0.159	-0.167	0.027
1989, 1994	0.1584	0.048	3.279	0.001	0.064	0.253
1994, 1999	0.6089	0.047	12.837	0.000	0.516	0.702
1999, 2004	0.6692	0.047	14.109	0.000	0.576	0.762
2004, 2009	0.8481	0.047	17.912	0.000	0.755	0.941
2009, 2014	0.6446	0.047	13.600	0.000	0.552	0.738
2014, 2020	0.5235	0.048	10.994	0.000	0.430	0.617
No. Observations:	7783	Log-Likelihood:	-1.6601e+05			
Df Model:	36	Df Residuals:	7746			
Pearson chi2:	7.12e+05	Deviance:	2.9751e+05			

Table 24: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality on 5-Year Citations. *Note:* This study serves as a robustness test. To capture 5-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2018 for this analysis.

Dep. Variable: 10 year citation	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.6405	0.036	-45.989	0.000	-1.710	-1.571
Paper novelty	0.1111	0.002	46.002	0.000	0.106	0.116
Atypicality of datasets	0.2962	0.004	79.292	0.000	0.289	0.304
Topic atypicality	-0.0481	0.003	-18.978	0.000	-0.053	-0.043
Data use frequency(log)	0.0773	0.001	52.417	0.000	0.074	0.080
NumAuthor	0.0874	0.001	125.526	0.000	0.086	0.089
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3840	0.002	250.016	0.000	0.381	0.387
ImpactFactor(log)	0.2616	0.002	113.997	0.000	0.257	0.266
NumDatasets	-0.0122	0.000	-33.842	0.000	-0.013	-0.012
Art	0.5567	0.123	4.524	0.000	0.316	0.798
Biology	0.4488	0.041	11.030	0.000	0.369	0.529
Business	0.0184	0.023	0.798	0.425	-0.027	0.064
Chemistry	0.4860	0.041	11.786	0.000	0.405	0.567
Computer_science	-0.6514	0.033	-19.960	0.000	-0.715	-0.587
Economics	0.5517	0.015	35.733	0.000	0.521	0.582
Engineering	-0.1249	0.073	-1.713	0.087	-0.268	0.018
Environmental_science	-0.0373	0.064	-0.587	0.558	-0.162	0.087
Geography	-0.1051	0.022	-4.692	0.000	-0.149	-0.061
Geology	1.0712	0.373	2.875	0.004	0.341	1.801
History	-1.0564	0.102	-10.393	0.000	-1.256	-0.857
Materials_science	-0.1202	0.437	-0.275	0.783	-0.976	0.735
Mathematics	1.0660	0.029	36.211	0.000	1.008	1.124
Medicine	0.3828	0.012	31.846	0.000	0.359	0.406
Philosophy	0.3285	0.129	2.553	0.011	0.076	0.581
Physics	3.1067	0.146	21.229	0.000	2.820	3.394
Political_science	0.1257	0.015	8.159	0.000	0.096	0.156
Psychology	0.1769	0.012	14.611	0.000	0.153	0.201
Sociology	0.7480	0.018	42.629	0.000	0.714	0.782
1974, 1979	-0.2142	0.036	-5.887	0.000	-0.285	-0.143
1979, 1984	-0.3048	0.034	-8.870	0.000	-0.372	-0.237
1984, 1989	-0.2200	0.033	-6.719	0.000	-0.284	-0.156
1989, 1994	0.0616	0.032	1.935	0.053	-0.001	0.124
1994, 1999	0.5551	0.031	17.760	0.000	0.494	0.616
1999, 2004	0.5775	0.031	18.456	0.000	0.516	0.639
2004, 2009	0.5861	0.031	18.727	0.000	0.525	0.647
2009, 2014	0.3365	0.031	10.715	0.000	0.275	0.398
No. Observations:	5518	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-2.5469e+05			
Df Model:	35	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	5482			
Pearson chi2:	1.03e+06	<b>Deviance:</b>	4.8044e+05			

Table S 25: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality on 10-Year Citations. *Note:* This study serves as a robustness test. To capture 10-year citations, we track publications in our dataset up to 2013 for this analysis.



Tables 26-29 present the effects of using atypical combinations of datasets on citations, based on a three-year analysis of publications released in four distinct time periods: before 1990, 1990-2000, 2000-2010, and 2010-2020.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-4.2499	0.040	-107.545	0.000	-4.327	-4.172
Paper novelty	0.0944	0.006	15.929	0.000	0.083	0.106
Atypicality of datasets	0.3803	0.007	54.521	0.000	0.367	0.394
Topic atypicality	-0.0716	0.004	-16.152	0.000	-0.080	-0.063
Data use frequency(log)	0.1196	0.003	37.825	0.000	0.113	0.126
NumAuthor	0.0548	0.001	67.097	0.000	0.053	0.056
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3999	0.003	131.562	0.000	0.394	0.406
ImpactFactor(log)	0.7222	0.006	117.636	0.000	0.710	0.734
NumDatasets	0.0011	0.000	3.099	0.002	0.000	0.002
Art	0.1108	0.393	0.282	0.778	-0.660	0.882
Biology	-0.4090	0.091	-4.473	0.000	-0.588	-0.230
Business	0.2628	0.048	5.523	0.000	0.170	0.356
Chemistry	-0.5522	0.092	-6.032	0.000	-0.732	-0.373
Computer_science	0.2867	0.061	4.690	0.000	0.167	0.407
Economics	1.2212	0.040	30.641	0.000	1.143	1.299
Engineering	0.5985	0.127	4.723	0.000	0.350	0.847
Environmental_science	-0.1153	0.144	-0.803	0.422	-0.397	0.166
Geography	-0.3872	0.053	-7.295	0.000	-0.491	-0.283
Geology	1.7828	0.550	3.241	0.001	0.705	2.861
History	-0.0534	0.237	-0.225	0.822	-0.518	0.412
Materials_science	-0.6510	0.845	-0.771	0.441	-2.307	1.005
Mathematics	-0.5828	0.083	-7.062	0.000	-0.745	-0.421
Medicine	0.8267	0.026	32.348	0.000	0.777	0.877
Philosophy	-1.8637	0.748	-2.492	0.013	-3.329	-0.398
Physics	-1.4598	0.504	-2.898	0.004	-2.447	-0.472
Political_science	0.9201	0.041	22.594	0.000	0.840	1.000
Psychology	0.2473	0.025	10.018	0.000	0.199	0.296
Sociology	0.7076	0.047	14.967	0.000	0.615	0.800
No. Observations:	4663	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-84732.			
Df Model:	27	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	4635			
Pearson chi2:	3.58e+05	<b>Deviance:</b>	1.5117e+05			

Table S 26: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality on 3-Year Citations for paper published between 2010 and 2020.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-5.7557	0.041	-139.019	0.000	-5.837	-5.675
Paper novelty	0.0001	0.005	0.022	0.982	-0.010	0.010
Atypicality of datasets	0.5501	0.007	74.228	0.000	0.536	0.565
Topic atypicality	-0.1025	0.006	-18.222	0.000	-0.114	-0.091
Data use frequency(log)	0.1401	0.003	43.364	0.000	0.134	0.146
NumAuthor	0.1137	0.001	99.210	0.000	0.111	0.116
AuthorExprience(log)	0.6075	0.003	178.333	0.000	0.601	0.614
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3711	0.005	79.411	0.000	0.362	0.380
NumDatasets	-0.0247	0.001	-30.974	0.000	-0.026	-0.023
Art	-3.5524	0.439	-8.096	0.000	-4.412	-2.692
Biology	0.1872	0.096	1.946	0.052	-0.001	0.376
Business	0.4262	0.057	7.451	0.000	0.314	0.538
Chemistry	1.1126	0.084	13.228	0.000	0.948	1.277
Computer_science	-0.6015	0.080	-7.496	0.000	-0.759	-0.444
Economics	1.2263	0.037	32.953	0.000	1.153	1.299
Engineering	-1.7638	0.207	-8.517	0.000	-2.170	-1.358
Environmental_science	0.1332	0.149	0.894	0.371	-0.159	0.425
Geography	0.0248	0.051	0.483	0.629	-0.076	0.126
Geology	14.7637	1.143	12.913	0.000	12.523	17.005
History	-3.0534	0.298	-10.263	0.000	-3.637	-2.470
Materials_science	-25.7187	4.949	-5.196	0.000	-35.419	-16.018
Mathematics	3.1481	0.052	61.074	0.000	3.047	3.249
Medicine	1.2871	0.026	48.627	0.000	1.235	1.339
Philosophy	3.5488	0.422	8.411	0.000	2.722	4.376
Physics	5.8489	0.373	15.685	0.000	5.118	6.580
Political_science	0.9305	0.038	24.241	0.000	0.855	1.006
Psychology	0.5765	0.027	21.286	0.000	0.523	0.630
Sociology	1.5516	0.046	33.536	0.000	1.461	1.642
No. Observations:	2810	Log-Likelihood:	-99085.			
Df Model:	27	Df Residuals:	2782			
Pearson chi2:	4.94e+05	Deviance:	1.8647e+05			

Table 27: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality on 3-Year Citations for paper published between 2000 and 2010.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-2.7339	0.069	-39.906	0.000	-2.868	-2.600
Paper novelty	0.3856	0.010	38.917	0.000	0.366	0.405
Atypicality of datasets	0.0391	0.016	2.507	0.012	0.009	0.070
Topic atypicality	0.0906	0.009	9.594	0.000	0.072	0.109
Data use frequency(log)	0.1957	0.006	30.935	0.000	0.183	0.208
NumAuthor	0.0338	0.005	6.355	0.000	0.023	0.044
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3902	0.006	69.051	0.000	0.379	0.401
ImpactFactor(log)	0.3418	0.009	37.677	0.000	0.324	0.360
NumDatasets	-0.0038	0.002	-2.439	0.015	-0.007	-0.001
Art	-0.0807	0.297	-0.271	0.786	-0.663	0.502
Biology	5.5991	0.135	41.544	0.000	5.335	5.863
Business	0.0214	0.077	0.277	0.782	-0.130	0.173
Chemistry	-2.0695	0.453	-4.566	0.000	-2.958	-1.181
Computer_science	-0.5673	0.124	-4.568	0.000	-0.811	-0.324
Economics	0.4759	0.054	8.761	0.000	0.369	0.582
Engineering	-2.2828	0.418	-5.462	0.000	-3.102	-1.464
Environmental_science	0.3978	0.240	1.661	0.097	-0.072	0.867
Geography	0.6588	0.081	8.182	0.000	0.501	0.817
Geology	-5.5128	1.142	-4.826	0.000	-7.752	-3.274
History	-1.0789	0.427	-2.526	0.012	-1.916	-0.242
Materials_science	7.2364	1.727	4.191	0.000	3.852	10.621
Mathematics	-1.9254	0.156	-12.351	0.000	-2.231	-1.620
Medicine	0.7698	0.046	16.675	0.000	0.679	0.860
Philosophy	-1.5685	0.535	-2.932	0.003	-2.617	-0.520
Physics	-1.3102	0.497	-2.635	0.008	-2.285	-0.336
Political_science	0.0624	0.052	1.193	0.233	-0.040	0.165
Psychology	-0.1112	0.048	-2.327	0.020	-0.205	-0.018
Sociology	0.1185	0.058	2.061	0.039	0.006	0.231
No. Observations:	1369	Log-Likelihood:	-22339.			
Df Model:	27	Df Residuals:	1341			
Pearson chi2:	8.68e+04	Deviance:	39856.			

Table 28: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality on 3-Year Citations for paper published between 1990 and 2000.

Dep. Variable: 3 year citation	coef	std err	z	P>  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-1.6950	0.142	-11.972	0.000	-1.973	-1.418
Paper novelty	0.1380	0.012	11.332	0.000	0.114	0.162
Atypicality of datasets	0.2252	0.037	6.095	0.000	0.153	0.298
Topic atypicality	-0.0262	0.020	-1.310	0.190	-0.066	0.013
Data use frequency(log)	0.0331	0.014	2.391	0.017	0.006	0.060
NumAuthor	-0.0083	0.016	-0.517	0.605	-0.040	0.023
AuthorExprience(log)	0.3132	0.010	32.549	0.000	0.294	0.332
ImpactFactor(log)	0.1821	0.019	9.698	0.000	0.145	0.219
NumDatasets	-0.0139	0.005	-2.937	0.003	-0.023	-0.005
Art	-21.1784	11.638	-1.820	0.069	-43.989	1.632
Biology	1.0751	0.507	2.122	0.034	0.082	2.068
Business	-0.5813	0.200	-2.906	0.004	-0.973	-0.189
Chemistry	8.2699	0.533	15.506	0.000	7.225	9.315
Computer_science	-0.4575	0.186	-2.457	0.014	-0.822	-0.093
Economics	1.0366	0.097	10.705	0.000	0.847	1.226
Engineering	-4.0168	0.775	-5.180	0.000	-5.537	-2.497
Environmental_science	-2.6149	1.054	-2.481	0.013	-4.681	-0.549
Geography	-0.0726	0.184	-0.395	0.693	-0.433	0.288
Geology	-6.612e-13	3.64e-13	-1.819	0.069	-1.37e-12	5.13e-14
History	-1.5640	0.400	-3.906	0.000	-2.349	-0.779
Materials_science	-0.0245	0.758	-0.032	0.974	-1.511	1.462
Mathematics	0.1311	0.213	0.616	0.538	-0.286	0.548
Medicine	0.2202	0.102	2.150	0.032	0.019	0.421
Philosophy	1.1093	0.406	2.732	0.006	0.314	1.905
Physics	-2.7589	1.156	-2.387	0.017	-5.024	-0.493
Political_science	0.0819	0.087	0.943	0.346	-0.088	0.252
Psychology	0.3542	0.084	4.194	0.000	0.189	0.520
Sociology	-0.1717	0.100	-1.712	0.087	-0.368	0.025
No. Observations:	721	Log-Likelihood:	-4241.0			
Df Model:	26	Df Residuals:	694			
Pearson chi2:	9.25e+03	Deviance:	6269.6			

Table S 29: the Poisson Regression Model Detail: the Effects of Atypicality of Data Combinations and Topic Atypicality on 3-Year Citations for paper published before 1990.

**-Alternative Impact Quantification:** We examined the impact of using atypical topic and atypical combinations of datasets on the likelihood of becoming top 5% hit papers – publications that received citations within the top 5% in our dataset.(Table 30)

Dep. Variable: top 5% hit paper (binary)	coef	std err	z	P >  z	[0.025	0.975]
Intercept	-11.2910	1.189	-9.493	0.000	-13.622	-8.960
Paper novelty	0.3528	0.087	4.074	0.000	0.183	0.523
Atypicality of datasets	0.4151	0.099	4.187	0.000	0.221	0.609
Topic atypicality	-0.1407	0.067	-2.106	0.035	-0.272	-0.010
Data use frequency(log)	0.1312	0.043	3.043	0.002	0.047	0.216
NumAuthor	0.0830	0.017	4.907	0.000	0.050	0.116
AuthorExprience(log)	0.5708	0.047	12.138	0.000	0.479	0.663
ImpactFactor(log)	0.5588	0.076	7.322	0.000	0.409	0.708
NumDatasets	0.0076	0.005	1.430	0.153	-0.003	0.018
Art	1.6738	3.441	0.486	0.627	-5.071	8.419
Biology	1.2921	1.071	1.206	0.228	-0.807	3.391
Business	-0.3590	0.728	-0.493	0.622	-1.787	1.069
Chemistry	1.6447	1.099	1.496	0.135	-0.509	3.799
Computer_science	-0.0239	0.936	-0.026	0.980	-1.859	1.811
Economics	1.0363	0.471	2.202	0.028	0.114	1.959
Engineering	0.5604	2.018	0.278	0.781	-3.395	4.516
Environmental_science	0.4675	1.676	0.279	0.780	-2.816	3.751
Geography	0.3234	0.641	0.505	0.614	-0.933	1.579
Geology	-341.3370	3.91e+05	-0.001	0.999	-7.66e+05	7.66e+05
History	-1.3602	3.585	-0.379	0.704	-8.387	5.666
Materials_science	-206.8201	3.33e+05	-0.001	1.000	-6.52e+05	6.52e+05
Mathematics	-0.9394	1.133	-0.829	0.407	-3.160	1.281
Medicine	0.5948	0.354	1.683	0.092	-0.098	1.288
Philosophy	-2.3853	6.182	-0.386	0.700	-14.502	9.731
Physics	7.6929	3.716	2.070	0.038	0.410	14.976
Political_science	-0.0296	0.491	-0.060	0.952	-0.992	0.933
Psychology	-0.0415	0.350	-0.119	0.906	-0.727	0.644
Sociology	0.7746	0.567	1.367	0.172	-0.336	1.885
1974, 1979	-1.3909	1.450	-0.959	0.338	-4.233	1.451
1979, 1984	-1.9994	1.446	-1.383	0.167	-4.834	0.835
1984, 1989	-1.4697	1.194	-1.231	0.218	-3.810	0.870
1989, 1994	-0.5749	1.085	-0.530	0.596	-2.701	1.551
1994, 1999	0.3249	1.056	0.308	0.758	-1.745	2.394
1999, 2004	0.4920	1.056	0.466	0.641	-1.577	2.561
2004, 2009	0.4193	1.056	0.397	0.691	-1.650	2.489
2009, 2014	-0.2743	1.058	-0.259	0.795	-2.348	1.800
2014, 2020	-0.4117	1.061	-0.388	0.698	-2.491	1.667
No. Observations:	8881	<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-1682.6			
Df Model:	36	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	8844			
Pearson chi2:	8.71e+03	<b>Deviance:</b>	3365.2			

Table S 30: Logistic regression model: investigating the impact of atypicality of data combinations and topic atypicality on achieving top 5 percent hit paper status. This study serves as a robustness test. The hit paper variable is binary, with 1 indicating that the publication received citations in the top 5 percent among all the papers in our dataset, and 0 otherwise.

(4) What type of research teams combine atypical datasets: Impact of Team Size and Team experience on likelihood of using Data Combination (Table 31-32)

Dep. Variable: Using Data Combination (using multiple dataset)	coef	std err	t	P>  t	[0.025	0.975]
<b>Intercept</b>	-0.8816	0.049	-18.071	0.000	-0.977	-0.786
<b>NumAuthor</b>	0.0104	0.005	2.000	0.046	0.000	0.021
<b>Data use frequency(log)</b>	0.1169	0.017	6.735	0.000	0.083	0.151
<b>ImpactFactor(log)</b>	-0.0725	0.007	-11.106	0.000	-0.085	-0.060
<b>Model:</b>	Logit	<b>Pseudo R-squ.:</b>	0.004525			
<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-18268	<b>Method:</b>	MLE			
<b>No. Observations:</b>	30366	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	30362			

Table S 31: Logistic regression results on the effect of team size (number of authors) of a publication on the using multiple dataset (data combination). An increase in the number of authors is associated with a higher probability of using multiple dataset (data combination).

Dep. Variable: Using Data Combination (using multiple dataset)	coef	std err	t	P>  t	[0.025	0.975]
<b>Intercept</b>	-1.0764	0.065	-16.609	0.000	-1.203	-0.949
<b>AuthorExprience(log)</b>	0.0368	0.007	4.929	0.000	0.022	0.051
<b>Data use frequency(log)</b>	-0.0762	0.007	-11.574	0.000	-0.089	-0.063
<b>ImpactFactor(log)</b>	0.1017	0.018	5.784	0.000	0.067	0.136
<b>Model:</b>	Logit	<b>Pseudo R-squ.:</b>	0.005088			
<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-18258.	<b>Method:</b>	MLE			
<b>No. Observations:</b>	30366	<b>Df Residuals:</b>	30362			

Table S 32: Logistic regression results on the effect of team experience (average citation of authors) of a publication on using multiple dataset (data combination). An increase in the number of authors is associated with a higher probability of using multiple dataset (data combination).

**- Impact of Team Size and Team experience on Atypicality of dataset combination (Table 33-34).**

Dep. Variable: Atypicality of dataset combination	coef	std err	t	P>  t	[0.025	0.975]
<b>Intercept</b>	2.6208	0.024	110.357	0.000	2.574	2.667
<b>numauthor</b>	-0.0106	0.003	-3.972	0.000	-0.016	-0.005
<b>AuthorExprience(log)</b>	-0.0275	0.004	-6.652	0.000	-0.036	-0.019
<b>ImpactFactor(log)</b>	0.0030	0.008	0.402	0.688	-0.012	0.018
<b>Model:</b>	OLS	<b>R-squared:</b>	0.009			
<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-7156.2	<b>F-statistic:</b>	25.74			
<b>No. Observations:</b>	8881	<b>AIC:</b>	1.432e+04			

Table S 33: OLS regression results on the effect of team experience (average citation of authors) of a publication on Atypicality of dataset combination. An increase in the team experience is associated with a lower chance of using atypical dataset combination.

Dep. Variable: Atypicality of dataset combination	coef	std err	t	P>  t	[0.025	0.975]
<b>Intercept</b>	2.4287	0.027	90.192	0.000	2.376	2.481
<b>AuthorExprience(log)</b>	-0.0140	0.003	-4.747	0.000	-0.020	-0.008
<b>Data use frequency(log)</b>	-0.0054	0.004	-1.477	0.140	-0.013	0.002
<b>ImpactFactor(log)</b>	0.0299	0.001	50.024	0.000	0.029	0.031
<b>NumDatasets</b>	0.0063	0.007	0.935	0.350	-0.007	0.020
<b>Model:</b>	OLS	<b>R-squared:</b>	0.227			
<b>Log-Likelihood:</b>	-6053.8	<b>Prob (F-statistic):</b>	650.1			
<b>No. Observations:</b>	8881	<b>AIC:</b>	1.212e+04			

Table S 34: OLS regression results on the effect of team experience (average citation of authors) of a publication on atypicality of dataset combinations. An increase in the team experience is associated with a lower atypicality of dataset combinations.

## 5. Regression Equations

We employ fixed effect Poisson models to quantify the relationship between the atypicality of data usage and scientific impact. These models control for confounders such as publication year, dataset use frequency, number of authors, author experience (measured by average citation count of authors in the targeted publication), number of datasets, estimated impact factor, and disciplines. Alternative measurements, null models, and analyses with different dataset samples further support our results (further details are provided in the SI Appendix section 4).

The initial analysis, conducted using Equation 4, investigates the relationship between the variable  $V_i^{DataComb}$  (Using data combination) and the citation impact, as depicted in Figure 1(a).

$$\text{Impact}_i \sim \text{Poisson}(V_i^{\text{DataComb}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (4)$$

The following/main analysis, conducted using Equation 5, investigates the relationship between the variable  $A_i^{\text{Data}}$  (Atpicality of datasets combinations) and the citation impact, as depicted in Figure 2(a).

$$\text{Impact}_i \sim \text{Poisson}(A_i^{\text{Data}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (5)$$

We then examine different approaches for defining the atypicality of dataset combinations. Utilizing Equation 6, we analyze the relationship between the variables  $A_i^{\text{TopicA}}$  (Topic atypicality) and citation impact. The findings are illustrated in Figure 3(b).

$$\text{Impact}_i \sim \text{Poisson}(A_i^{\text{Data}} + A_i^{\text{TopicA}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (6)$$

Finally, the relationship between team size, team experience, the likelihood of utilizing data combination, and the atypicality of dataset combinations in academic papers is examined using Equation 7, 8, 9, and 10, as depicted in Figure 4(a)(b).

$$\text{DataCombination}_i \sim \text{Logistic}(V_i^{\text{Teamsize}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (7)$$

$$\text{DataCombination}_i \sim \text{Logistic}(V_i^{\text{TeamExperience}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (8)$$

$$A_i^{\text{Data}} \sim \text{OLS}(V_i^{\text{TeamSize}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (9)$$

$$A_i^{\text{Data}} \sim \text{OLS}(V_i^{\text{TeamExperience}} + \sum_k X_{ik}) \quad (10)$$